

# ANGLICAN TEACHING

An Exposition of

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

*by*

W. G. WILSON, M.A., B.D., Ph.D.

*and*

J. H. TEMPLETON, M.A., B.D., M.LITT., Ph.D.

*With a Foreword by*

*THE ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH*

DUBLIN

ASSOCIATION FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

# CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
FOREWORD BY THE ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH <i>(Most Rev. James McCann, Ph.D., D.D.)</i>	xi
PREFACE .. .. .	1
INTRODUCTION .. .. .	5
I THE PERSONS OF THE GODHEAD ..	
Article 1. Of Faith in the Holy Trinity ..	13
Article 2. Of the Word, or Son of God ..	24
Article 3. Of the going down of Christ into Hell .. .. .	34
Article 4. Of the Resurrection of Christ ..	36
Article 5. Of the Holy Ghost .. .. .	43
II THE SCRIPTURES AND CREEDS	
Article 6. Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures .. .. .	47
Article 7. Of the Old Testament ..	55
Article 8. Of the Three Creeds .. .. .	61
III THE NATURE OF MAN	
Article 9. Of Original or Birth-sin ..	65
Article 10. Of Free-will .. .. .	71
Article 15. Of Christ alone without Sin ..	75
Article 16. Of Sin after Baptism .. .. .	81
IV THE SALVATION OF MAN	
Article 11. Of the Justification of Man ..	87
Article 12. Of Good Works .. .. .	96
Article 13. Of Works before Justification ..	100
Article 14. Of Works of Supererogation ..	104
Article 17. Of Predestination and Election ..	108
Article 18. Of obtaining eternal Salvation by Christ .. .. .	115

First published 1962

© WILSON & TEMPLETON, DUBLIN 1962

The authors acknowledge with thanks permission to reprint the article on "Christian Initiation", which was published in the *Church Quarterly Review*, Vol. CLVII, Jan.-Mar. 1957.

—◇—

*Made and printed in the Republic of Ireland by  
ALEX THOM & CO. LTD., DUBLIN.*

V	THE CHURCH		
	Article 19. Of the Church	.. ..	121
VI	THE CHURCH'S AUTHORITY IN DOCTRINE		
	Article 20. Of the Authority of the Church		129
	Article 21. Of the Authority of General Councils	.. ..	135
	Article 22. Of Purgatory	.. ..	140
VII	THE CHURCH'S AUTHORITY IN DISCIPLINE		
	Article 24. Of Speaking in the Congregation	.. ..	149
	Article 32. Of the Marriage of Priests	.. ..	152
	Article 33. Of Excommunicate Persons	.. ..	154
	Article 34. Of the Traditions of the Church		157
	Article 35. Of the Homilies	.. ..	161
VIII	THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH		
	Article 23. Of Ministering in the Congregation	.. ..	165
	Article 36. Of Consecration of Bishops and Ministers	.. ..	165
IX	THE SACRAMENTS		
	Article 25. Of the Sacraments		179
	Article 26. Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers	.. ..	184
	Article 27. Of Baptism	.. ..	188
	Article 28. Of the Lord's Supper	.. ..	194
	Article 29. Of the Wicked which do not eat Christ's Body in the Lord's Supper	.. ..	199
	Article 30. Of Both Kinds	.. ..	202
	Article 31. Of the one oblation of Christ	.. ..	205
X	CHURCH AND STATE		
	Article 37. Of the Civil Magistrates	.. ..	209
	Article 38. Of Christian Men's Goods not common	.. ..	217

Article 39. Of a Christian Man's Oath	..	220
---------------------------------------	----	-----

APPENDIX A. QUESTIONS FOR USE IN DISCUSSION GROUPS		225
--	--	-----

APPENDIX B. CHRISTIAN INITIATION—A Reprint of an Article on Holy Baptism and Confirmation, published in the <i>Church Quarterly Review</i> , Vol. CLVII, Jan.—Mar. 1957.		233
--	--	-----

APPENDIX C. MODERN COSMOLOGY AND CREATION		253
---	--	-----

GENERAL INDEX	.. ..	257
---------------	-------	-----

## FOREWORD

I am happy to accept the kind invitation of Dr. Wilson and his collaborator Dr. Templeton, to write a foreword to this book which they have written on the 'Thirty-nine Articles' in our Book of Common Prayer.

It is most important that the Christian 'apologia' should be made clear, as it has been done in this book.

Our Church of Ireland is greatly indebted to these two scholars, who have used the leisure afforded them, when their parochial tasks have been carried out, to study deeply the records of our Reformation era, and to present their interpretation of our past history in modern language.

The original purpose of the 'Articles' was to instruct people in the Faith. The essential principles of continuity and change are embedded in our historic tradition. In each generation, therefore, it becomes necessary to explain the truths of the Christian Creeds in the setting and situation of the day.

The most remarkable phenomenon in twentieth century Christendom is the world-wide movement towards re-union. An understanding of the 'Thirty-nine Articles' throws light on the special genius and place of the Anglican Communion as a 'Bridge Church' which claims to hold firmly every doctrine taught in the Apostolic Age as 'de fide' and as 'necessary for salvation'.

This study makes plain the 'setting' in which the Articles were produced in the Elizabethan period, when the scholars of that time in 'Ecclesia Anglicana' were guided towards a 'via media' between the extremes of the Church of Rome on the one hand, and the variety of 'sectaries' on the other. The appeal to Scripture and Antiquity convinced them that

Christian Truth was to be found along a 'middle pathway'.

This is illustrated in the study of Articles VI, XIX, XX and XXXIV. Those who are interested especially in the 'ecumenical movement' will find the treatment of these particular Articles illuminating.

The 'Questions for Use in Discussion Groups—Appendix A' is a very valuable addition to this work, and should be most helpful.

Dr. Wilson's appendix on 'Christian Initiation' and Dr. Templeton's on 'Cosmology' will be of interest also, and of use to students in these subjects.

I commend this valuable work to all within or without our Communion who are working for Unity and Fellowship in Christ's Church.

JAMES ARMAGH  
*Archbishop of Armagh and  
Primate of All Ireland.*

*The Palace,  
Armagh,  
5 April, 1962.*

## PREFACE

THIS book is offered to members of the Anglican Communion in the conviction that there is a great need within our Church for more teaching manuals which will present the dogmatic principles of Anglicanism in an easily assimilated form. In many parts of the world members of our Communion are subject to persistent efforts to undermine their faith and loyalty to the Church. Quite apart from the spread of humanism and secularized systems of education which foster a purely materialistic outlook on life, and must be met with informed Christian opinion, the activities of the sects often present the Church with a challenge which cannot be ignored. Even as early as 1536 when the Ten Articles were published, the crop of heresies which sprang from the religious licence accompanying the Reformation, and then known under the general name of Anabaptism, had begun to infect the Church of England. This fact has an important bearing on the contents of the Thirty-nine Articles, more than half of which deal with 'the pestilent and heinous heresies of the sects', as Ridley described them, rather than with the corruptions of the Roman Church. Anabaptism revived the whole gamut of erroneous doctrines which vexed the early Church, besides introducing novelties of its own, and demanded a fairly full restatement of orthodox teaching in reply.

The Commission on Evangelism appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York emphasized the fundamental importance of dogma in any really effective presentation of the Gospel. 'Dogma is the core of every system of faith and worship; without it, religion would dissolve into mere sentiment and would, in a few generations, perish altogether'. Out of dogma emerges Christian doctrine, which is 'the formulation of

revealed truth in current terms, together with the deductions implicit within it'. The Commission considered that 'a grasp of doctrine, derived from the Bible as the Word of God, is the essential equipment of an evangelist, and one that has never been more needed than to-day'. The revival of interest in theology amongst university students, the increasing emphasis on Adult Religious Education, and the growing recognition of the layman's place in Evangelism, all underline the need for more authoritative teaching manuals. We believe that a study of the Thirty-nine Articles in relation to the teaching of the Bible can do much to meet this need. On the basic Christian beliefs the Articles contain a careful, well-balanced statement of the historic Church's interpretation of the revelation of God in Christ, with which modern thought is more in sympathy than is usually supposed. 'The times call urgently for the Anglican witness to Scripture, tradition and reason—alike for meeting the problems which Biblical theology is creating, for serving the reintegration of the Church, and for presenting the faith as at once supernatural and related to contemporary man. This witness demands a costly devotion to truth and a conviction that theology is not merely a handmaid to administration, but a prime activity of the Church.'<sup>1</sup>

A study of the teaching of the Articles is also relevant for another reason. In many parts of the world members of the Anglican Communion are joining in discussions on Church Unity and are seeking to overcome theological barriers to reunion. In some cases, however, legal barriers may prove to be more formidable than theological differences. For instance, it has been pointed out that in the case of the Church of Ireland the tenets and principles of the Church as set out in the Preamble and Declaration adopted by the General Convention in 1870 'are essential to its identity and all church property, and all funds held for any church purpose, are held upon trusts of which the several provisions of the Preamble constitute an integral part'.<sup>2</sup> The Preamble states that the Church of Ireland will maintain communion with other

<sup>1</sup>Archbishop A. M. Ramsey, *From Goreth Temple* (1960) p. vi.

<sup>2</sup>*The Constitution of the Church of Ireland*, (1946) p. vi.

churches 'agreeing in the principles of this Declaration'. It is difficult to see how she could enter into full communion with any church which felt unable to accept those principles, for if she were to compromise on any of those principles for the sake of reunion, she might risk the forfeiture, by sequestration, of all her property and endowments. The same risk would doubtless face some other parts of the Anglican Communion contemplating reunion. As in the case of the Church of Ireland, one of the Fundamental Provisions of the Uganda Constitution declares:

'1. The Church of Uganda doth hold and maintain the doctrines and sacraments of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded in His Holy Word and as the Church of England hath received and explained the same in the Book of Common Prayer, and in the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and further it disclaims for itself the right of altering any of the aforesaid standards of faith and doctrine.'

If theological discussions on reunion are to achieve practical results cognizance must be taken of such Declarations and of their legal force and implications. A fresh study of the Reformation formularies (such as the Thirty-nine Articles) against the background of the teaching of Scripture and early Church practice may be useful, before we attempt to draft any doctrinal statements as a basis for reunion. As Dr. Broomfield so rightly says, 'The faith of the One Holy Catholic Church, when it is again united, will not be limited to what is common to all the various groups into which Christians are now divided. That would be a sad impoverishment. On the contrary, it must include everything which is true in the faith of each and all of them. Similarly the Order and practice of the united Church must be such as to preserve everything of real and permanent value . . . If this is so, unity is to be sought not by a readiness to minimize—much less to abandon—the things which distinguish us from our brethren, but rather by an eagerness to discover whatever is true and valuable in the things which

distinguish them from us'.<sup>1</sup> As, in the past, those who sought the reformation of the Church were obliged to think out and express the principles for which they stood, so those who to-day seek the reunion of the Church must re-examine their principles. How far, for instance, are the Thirty-nine Articles in accord with the teaching and practices of the Primitive Church? We hope that a study of the following pages may indicate an answer to that important question.

We should like to express our gratitude to the Bishop of Cashel, Rt. Rev. W. C. de Pawley, and to the Rev. T. N. D. C. Salmon, who read the typescript and made many helpful suggestions. We are also deeply indebted to Mr. A. G. Gray for the keen personal interest he has taken in the production of the book.

W. G. WILSON  
J. H. TEMPLETON

*Feast of the Epiphany,*  
1962.

## INTRODUCTION

THE Thirty-nine Articles are associated with many other doctrinal statements issued during the Reformation in Europe. In order to justify their actions, those who disapproved of the doctrine and practices of the Church of Rome were obliged to examine and express in print the principles for which they stood. It is necessary to know something of the other formularies of faith which appeared in the sixteenth century, before we state our own position.

One of the earliest of the Reformation formularies,<sup>1</sup> and by far the most important, was the *Confession of Augsburg* (1530) drawn up mainly by Melancthon, revised by Luther, and presented to the Diet<sup>2</sup> at Augsburg. It consisted of 21 Articles on matters of faith, and 7 Articles protesting against abuses. On the whole it was moderate in tone and aimed at reformation within the Church, if possible. In 1552 it was enlarged to Thirty-five Articles, and presented to the Council of Trent by the ambassadors of Würtemberg, and in that form is known as *The Würtemberg Confession*. The influence of these Confessions on our Articles is noted in our exposition.

In 1530, Zwingli, a Swiss reformer, also presented a Confession to the Diet of Augsburg. After his death, his followers put forward their views in the *Confession of Basle* and the *First Helvetic Confession* (1536). But none of these documents had any positive influence on our Articles. Other well-known Continental documents were Calvin's *Institutes* (1549), the *Saxon Confession* (1551), and the *Second Helvetic Confession* (1566), the work of Henry Bullinger.

<sup>1</sup>There were one or two earlier documents, such as Luther's Greater and Lesser Catechisms (1527-29), the Articles of Schwabach (1529) and Torgau (1530).

<sup>2</sup>The English name for a foreign Parliament.

The first English statement of doctrine was issued with the approval of Convocation as *The Ten Articles* (1536), a compromise designed to promote unity between the Roman Catholic and the reforming parties. The first five of these Articles dealt with doctrine: the Rule of Faith was based on the Bible, the three Creeds, and decisions of the Four Great Councils; three Sacraments (Baptism, the Eucharist, and Penance) were affirmed as instituted by Christ, and the Real Presence<sup>1</sup> was asserted; the Royal Supremacy was substituted for Papal Supremacy.<sup>2</sup> The second five Articles were mainly concerned with ceremonies, and permitted the use of images, the honouring and invoking of saints,<sup>3</sup> encouraged prayers for the dead, and denounced abuses connected with Purgatory and Indulgences.<sup>4</sup>

*The Ten Articles* remained effective until 1543. Meanwhile, a practical handbook of instruction, based on the Ten Articles, appeared in 1537 as *The Institution of a Christian Man*, commonly called *The Bishops' Book*.<sup>5</sup> It was the work of a committee under Archbishop Cranmer, and was issued with the authority of the Bishops, though it never gained the King's authority because of its poor theology and literary style. In 1543 a revised edition, based on the King's criticisms, was produced under the title *The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*, commonly called *The King's Book*.<sup>6</sup> It was more anti-Protestant, and reflected the reaction then developing against further reform.

In 1538, the King had invited three Lutheran Divines over to consult with Archbishop Cranmer and two other Bishops on matters of faith. The *Confession of Augsburg* was used as a basis for discussion. Henry, however, would not agree to

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Article XXVIII.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Article XXXVII.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Article XXII.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Article XXII.

<sup>5</sup>The Creed, Seven Sacraments, Ten Commandments, Ave Maria, Lord's Prayer, Justification and Purgatory were explained. Baptism, Eucharist, and Penance were placed higher than other Sacraments.

<sup>6</sup>Transubstantiation, Clerical celibacy, and implied equality of all Seven Sacraments, were its chief characteristics.

Communion in Both Kinds,<sup>1</sup> Clerical Marriage, or the condemnation of propitiatory Masses, and the conference broke down, but not before *The Thirteen Articles* were compiled.<sup>2</sup> They were not published then, but were later found amongst Cranmer's papers, and are important because they form a link between the Augsburg Confession and our present Articles<sup>3</sup>.

When the Pope excommunicated Henry in 1538, the King reacted in proclaiming his orthodoxy by applying 'The Whip with the Six Strings' (*The Six Articles* of 1539), which was incorporated in an Act of Parliament popularly called 'The Bloody Statute of the Six Articles.' The Act compelled the acceptance of Transubstantiation (though the actual word is avoided), Clerical Celibacy, Communion in One Kind, the obligation of Vows of Chastity, the use of Private Masses, and Auricular Confession. Thenceforth no further move towards the reformation of the doctrine of the Church was possible while Henry VIII lived.

On the accession of Edward VI in 1547, Cranmer and his colleagues were able to continue the work of reformation. First came the revised Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552. Although no new Articles were officially authorized for some years, there is evidence that as early as 1549 Cranmer required preachers and lecturers in Divinity to assent to certain Articles of Religion. In the same year, a committee under his chairmanship drew up a scheme for the Reform of Church Law (*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*) which, though it was not published by authority, accords very closely with the language of some of our present Articles.

In 1551, Cranmer was directed to prepare a Book of Articles, which he showed to some of the Bishops. But it was May 1552 before the Council asked Convocation for them. They originally numbered 45, but after revision by the Royal Chaplain,

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Article XXX.

<sup>2</sup>The Thirteen Articles were derived largely from Seventeen Articles drawn up by Luther and Melancthon in 1536 and handed to the English Ambassadors, Fox and Heath. Some of the Thirteen Articles were word for word the same as their German counterparts in the Seventeen Articles.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Article XXIII.



were reduced to 42, and published, by Royal command, in Latin and English, in 1553 as *The Forty-Two Articles*. They were mainly the work of Cranmer, who in compiling them made use of the Thirteen Articles of 1538, and the *Confession of Augsburg*.<sup>1</sup> It is still doubtful whether they were approved by Convocation, but the point is not of great significance, for they were put forth by the King's authority only seven weeks before his death. On the accession of Queen Mary they were dropped—they had not been enforced by Act of Parliament and there was no need to repeal them. Once more the reforming process was halted.

When Queen Elizabeth I came to the throne in 1558, Prayer Book revision took precedence over the Articles. But, as a temporary measure, Archbishop Parker drew up and circulated amongst the clergy *The Eleven Articles* (1559), dealing with the authority of Scripture, the rights of National Churches, the Royal Supremacy, and Roman errors such as private masses, communion in one Kind, and the extolling of images and relics. These Articles were never legally binding except in Ireland, where they were in force from 1566 until superseded by the Thirty-nine Articles in 1615. All Ministers at their first entry into their cures, and twice yearly afterwards, were required to read them publicly.

Meanwhile, Archbishop Parker, with the help of Bishop Cox of Ely, and Bishop Guest of Rochester, was working on a revision of *The Forty-Two Articles* of 1553. As in 1553, Cranmer had used the *Thirteen Articles* (based on the *Confession of Augsburg*), so once more Lutheran influence made itself felt when Parker drew upon *The Württemberg Confession* in making his revision of 1563. Four of the original Forty-two were struck out (viz: Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, Of Grace, Of the Moral Law, Against the Millenarians) and four others substituted: Of the Holy Ghost (V), Of Good Works (XII), Of Communion in Both Kinds (XXX), Of the Non-participation of the Wicked in the Holy Communion

<sup>1</sup>He apparently did not use the *Confession of Augsburg* direct, but through the Thirteen Articles, especially on Articles I, II, IV, IX, XIV, XVI, XXIII, XXIV, XXV.

(XXIX). Convocation passed only 39 of the 42, and the Queen (i) reduced the number to 38 by striking out Article XXIX to avoid offending the Roman Catholic party, and (ii) added the opening clause in Article XX, taken from *The Württemberg Confession*.

The *Thirty-eight Articles* remained unaltered until 1571. The Queen's excommunication by the Pope in 1570 destroyed any hope of reconciliation. It was no longer necessary, then, to fear that Article XXIX would hurt their feelings, and it was accordingly incorporated. A few other minor changes were made, including the addition of four books in the list of the Apocrypha (Article VI). As revised, the *Thirty-nine Articles* were then passed by Convocation, and received the sanction of Parliament in 1571. Since then they have been "received and approved" as authoritative standards of doctrine by most of the branches of the Anglican Communion.

In many parts of the Anglican Communion every clergyman, when he is made a Deacon, ordained Priest, consecrated Bishop, or licensed for a benefice or curacy, is required to declare his assent to the *Thirty-nine Articles*. The Ordinal requires every Priest at his ordination to vow 'always so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church hath received the same.' The Ordinal thus allows little scope for the teaching of novel or personal opinions; only 'received' doctrine is to be taught. Hence one of the chief uses of the Articles to-day is that they provide a body of official teaching.

It was the declared aim and object of the Anglican Reformers to cleave to the faith and practice of the Primitive Church. They made a two-fold appeal to Scripture and Antiquity one of their basic principles. In matters of doctrine, the appeal to Scripture as the supreme Rule of Faith was always regarded as final; in questions as to the correct interpretation of Scripture, and in matters of ceremonial they preferred to be guided by the practice of the Primitive Church. In the fifth century, St. Vincent of Lerins formulated a rule for distinguishing Catholic truth from falsehood, and his rule

has won general acceptance ever since. The most important part of his rule or 'canon' is as follows:

'In the Catholic Church itself all possible care must be taken that we hold that faith which has been believed everywhere, always, and by all. For that is truly and in the strictest sense Catholic, which, as the name itself and the reason of the thing declare, comprehends all universally. This rule we shall observe if we follow universality, antiquity, consent.'

To put it more simply, St. Vincent's rule is (a) that we should generally follow the teaching of the majority, but (b) since even the majority of any generation may teach something which is not true, we should verify the teaching of the majority by asking, Have the majority of Christians in every generation believed so? That is the real test of what is Catholic doctrine and what is not Catholic.

At the Reformation, the leaders of our Church stoutly resisted any suggestion that they were departing from Catholic teaching. They maintained that they were merely reforming the teaching of the Church to bring it into line with the teaching and practices of the Primitive Church, by rejecting the new articles which had been added to the Faith by the Church of Rome.

Following this traditional appeal to Scripture and Antiquity, we have given references to Scripture and early authorities wherever possible, to demonstrate the Catholicity of the teaching of the Articles.

The Articles also illustrate another basic principle of the Anglican Reformation—the quest for the *Via Media*, the middle path between extremes. Faced with the doctrines of Rome on the one hand, and the novel ideas and practices of the Continental Reformers on the other, the English Reformers tried to follow the middle path in many cases—not for reasons of expediency, but because, in Saunderson's words, 'The *mean* between the two *extremes* seems to be the truer opinion.' That principle is generally true in life to-day, as in every generation, even though some disparage it as mere 'compromise' If in

some of the Articles, the zeal for reform may seem to have gone to extremes, allowance must be made for the fact that the text of many of them was hammered out in the heat of controversy. 'Their statements must always be taken in the light of the circumstances which brought them forth.'

The relevance of the Articles to-day lies in the fact that, for the most part, they speak, albeit in dated language, of eternal truth—of the nature of God, the life and work of Christ as Saviour, the origin of the Holy Spirit; of the nature of man, his sinfulness and need of grace; of the mercy and love of God displayed in our justification and salvation; of the nature and work of the Church, its Ministry, its Doctrine and Sacraments; and of the relationship between the Church and the world through which we pass, as pilgrims on the road to an Eternal Destiny.

## Chapter I

# THE PERSONS OF THE GODHEAD

## Article I

### OF FAITH IN THE HOLY TRINITY<sup>1</sup>

There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

THE Christian Church does not, in the first instance, attempt to convince men of the existence of God. She is a witness rather than an uncertain inquirer. Instead of speculating how to establish God's existence, she teaches men, on God's authority, what God is like. The Articles rightly commence with certain dogmatic statements about the Godhead, in unity of substance and Trinity of Persons, because a true conception of the nature of God is the fundamental basis of true religion.

A study of the Bible suggests that we should not expect the existence of God to be demonstrated like a problem in mathematics. 'He that cometh unto God must begin by an act of believing (Greek, *pisteusai*) that He is, and that He is found a Rewarder to them that seek Him out.'<sup>2</sup> Our logical faculties must be supported by an act of faith on our part, but having made that initial act of faith in God, we find that it is reasonable to believe in Him. Belief in a supernatural power seems to be part of man's nature, for no tribe is known that has not some such belief. The presence of life in a world in which there was originally no life, proclaims the existence of a Life-giver. Everything in existence must have an adequate cause, the existence of the Universe showing evidence of

---

<sup>1</sup>This Article dates from 1533 and is derived mainly from the First Article of the Confession of Augsburg (1530) and the last of the Thirteen Articles of 1538.

<sup>2</sup>Heb. xi.6.

intelligence, presupposes an intelligent First Cause. Likewise, the evidence of a moral sense in mankind points to a moral Creator.

The Article declares *'there is but one living and true God'*. The unity of God was affirmed in the Creed of the Jewish Church: 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord,'<sup>1</sup> endorsed by Jesus,<sup>2</sup> and proclaimed by the Apostolic Church.<sup>3</sup> It is more than numerical unity: it is essential unity.<sup>4</sup> There cannot be more than one First Cause. The Bible repeatedly describes Him as the 'Living God'<sup>5</sup>, and in the Article the use of *vivus* instead of *vivens* indicates that He is not merely 'alive', but is the Source of all life<sup>6</sup>. He is also described as 'the living and true God' in the Bible<sup>7</sup>, and the use of the Greek word *alethinos*, paralleled by the Latin word *verus* in the Article, means that He is the only true, genuine, God<sup>8</sup> as contrasted with false gods. This belief that the Divine Nature is one and indivisible is quite an exceptional conception. In fact, belief in *'one living and true God . . . the Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible'*, Who freely wills the existence of all else that is, is reached and maintained only in the Hebrew-Christian revelation. It is not found in ancient mythology, according to which the gods themselves are evolved in the course of Nature. The idea of a Creator-God first appears among the most historically conscious people in the world, Israel; they were the only nation that believed their God had given them the promise of a glorious future, and that He was sufficiently powerful to control events for that purpose. It is because He is the 'living God', the God of effective Providence who performs 'mighty acts' in pursuance of His intention in history, that He is also the 'true' God, whose Name has reality behind it.

When we talk or write about God we find ourselves, like the

<sup>1</sup>Deut. vi. 4.

<sup>2</sup>Mark xii. 29.

<sup>3</sup>I Cor. viii. 4, 6; Ephes. iv. 6; Jas. ii. 9.

<sup>4</sup>Deut. vi. 4; Isa. xli. 4; xlv. 6; xlviii. 12.

<sup>5</sup>Josh. iii. 10; Dan. vi. 26; Matt. xvi. 16; Jn. vi. 57; Acts xiv. 15, etc.

<sup>6</sup>Jn. v. 26, cf. Ps. xlii. 2.

<sup>7</sup>Jer. x. 10; I Thess. i. 9; I Jn. v. 20.

<sup>8</sup>Jn. xvii. 3; Isa. xlv. 8ff.;

biblical writers, describing Him in words normally associated with human life. We think of Him as a 'personal' God. He can love<sup>1</sup> or be angry<sup>2</sup>, be grieved<sup>3</sup>, jealous<sup>4</sup>, or merciful<sup>5</sup>. He is said to have a will<sup>6</sup>, and a mind and a purpose<sup>7</sup>, and we find frequent metaphorical references to His hands<sup>8</sup>, heart<sup>9</sup>, lips<sup>10</sup>, mouth<sup>11</sup>, arms<sup>12</sup>, eyes<sup>13</sup>, and voice<sup>14</sup>. If such metaphorical references were interpreted too literally, we would be in danger of thinking of God as little more than a man<sup>15</sup>, with all the limitations and imperfections of our finite human personalities. To guard against this error, the Article declares that God is *'everlasting, without body, parts, or passions, of infinite power, wisdom and goodness.'* Our lives are subject to all the limitations imposed upon us by time and space; but God is *'everlasting'*.<sup>16</sup> There was no moment of time when He first came into being. Time does not hamper His knowledge or His power. He does not grow old or weary.<sup>17</sup> Because He is Spirit,<sup>18</sup> He is *'without body'* unlimited by any considerations of space, and can be present in all places at the same time<sup>19</sup>. He is also *'without parts'* (Latin, *impartibilis*), incapable of being divided in any sense. We may suffer from inner conflicts, but He is at one within Himself. What from our standpoint are separate attributes, such as His love and His wrath, are really 'aspects of one consistent and unchanging being'. Likewise, He is *'without passions'* (Latin, *impassibilis*); He is not fickle and does

<sup>1</sup>Hos. xi. 1; Isa. xl. 4; Jn. xv. 9.

<sup>2</sup>Jn. iii. 36; Deut. xxxiii. 16; Rev. xiv. 10.

<sup>3</sup>Ps. lxxviii. 40; Isa. lxiii. 10 (R.V.); Ephes. iv. 30.

<sup>4</sup>Exod. xx. 5; Deut. xxxii. 16.

<sup>5</sup>Ps. lxxxvi. 15; Ps. ciii. 8, 11; Heb. viii. 12.

<sup>6</sup>Matt. vii. 21; Jn. vi. 39; Ephes. i. 11; I Jn. v. 14.

<sup>7</sup>Rom. xi. 34; I Cor. ii. 16; Jn. x. 15; Acts. iv. 28.

<sup>8</sup>Ps. cii. 25; Heb. i. 10, etc.

<sup>9</sup>Gen. viii. 21; Job. xxxiv. 14.

<sup>10</sup>Job xi. 5.

<sup>11</sup>I Kings viii. 15.

<sup>12</sup>Job xl. 9; Ps. lxxvii. 15.

<sup>13</sup>Ezra v. 5; Ps. xxx. 18.

<sup>14</sup>Job xl. 9; Deut. iv. 33.

<sup>15</sup>Anthropomorphism, the attribution of a human form to the Deity.

<sup>16</sup>Ps. xc. 2; Rom. i. 20; xvi. 26; Rev. i. 8.

<sup>17</sup>Isa. xl. 28.

<sup>18</sup>Jn. iv. 24 (R.V.).

<sup>19</sup>Ps. cxxxix; Prov. xv. 3; Acts xvii. 27.

not change<sup>1</sup>, or do anything inconsistent such as contradicting Himself<sup>2</sup>, or telling a lie.<sup>3</sup>

The Article then proceeds to state some of the more positive attributes of God, as possessing 'infinite power, wisdom and goodness'. All things are possible with Him<sup>4</sup>, nothing can escape His knowledge,<sup>5</sup> and His 'great goodness' is self-evident<sup>6</sup>. He is also 'the Maker and Preserver of all things visible and invisible'. We do not know how God created the world, but we believe that He did. 'It is by faith that we understand that the world was fashioned by the Word of God, and thus the visible was made out of the invisible'<sup>7</sup>. 'He spake and it was done'<sup>8</sup>. 'He commanded and they were created'<sup>9</sup>. As a building originates in the mind of the architect before it becomes visible in outward form, so all created things had their origin in the Creator<sup>10</sup>. God also dwells in His world and is present in all life. 'In Him we live, and move and have our being'<sup>11</sup>, He is over all and through all and in all<sup>12</sup>.

The declaration in the Article on the creative and preserving relationship of God to all other existence requires further explanation. The Old Testament depicts God calling His servants the prophets to whom He reveals the divine secret<sup>13</sup>; the ambitions and aggressions of powerful empires are seen to further His designs, and world-leaders, unknown to themselves, are the instruments of His purpose<sup>14</sup>; even the distribution and migrations of mankind are according to His will<sup>15</sup>. Evidence of the 'mighty acts' of God in history suggested that not only history itself, but also the world, the scene of history,

<sup>1</sup>Mal.iii.6; Jas.i.17.

<sup>2</sup>I Tim. ii.13.

<sup>3</sup>Heb.vi.18(R.V.); Num.xxiii.19; I Sam.xv.29.

<sup>4</sup>Matt.xix.26.

<sup>5</sup>Matt.x.29f.

<sup>6</sup>Ps.cxlv.7-12; Rom.ii.4.

<sup>7</sup>Heb.xi.3 (Moffatt).

<sup>8</sup>Ps.xxxiii.9.

<sup>9</sup>Ps.cxlviii.5.

<sup>10</sup>Rom.xi.36.

<sup>11</sup>Acts xvii.28.

<sup>12</sup>Ephes.iv.6.

<sup>13</sup>Cf. Amos iii.7.

<sup>14</sup>Isa. xlv.1-14.

<sup>15</sup>Amos ix.7, etc.

must owe its existence to God; all things whatsoever derive from and depend on Him. The Old Testament doctrine of God, in its highest expression, brings together His sovereignty in the over-ruling of history and His lordship over Nature<sup>1</sup>; the one is the complement of the other. He who appoints the heathen king, Cyrus the Persian, to free His people from captivity in Babylon is also the Creator of the host of heaven and of the ends of the earth; the heathen deities are idols and nothing, and their worship is scorned<sup>2</sup>. The growing perception among the Jews of divine omnipotence led at last to the view that God made the world 'out of nothing' (ex nihilo); the logic of Providence, as Origen saw, required it, and this belief became the Standard one in Christianity<sup>3</sup>.

God is not a fabricator working on matter which is already there; but must we think of Him as a conjuror Who calls something into being from non-existence? By its researches into the nature of matter, science has followed it beyond the boundaries of the concrete, and found that it is nothing like the stuff of our work-a-day surroundings; under analysis it passes into a concept in the mind of the mathematician and is represented by an algebraic formula. Hence, there is nothing either in science or theology against viewing the universe as a projection of divine thought. This means that 'creation out of nothing' is better expanded into 'creation out of nothing outside God Himself'.

The problem of creation, then, turns out to be one of describing the conversion of thought into matter. According to some scientists the borderline between the visible and the invisible has now been reached; new matter is coming into existence before our eyes: 'at one time the various atoms composing the material do not exist, and at a later time they do'. In answer to the question where the new atoms come from, Dr. Hoyle says 'it does not come from anywhere.

<sup>1</sup>Isa. xl-lv.

<sup>2</sup>Isa. xl, xliv, xlv.

<sup>3</sup>It first occurs in the apocryphal Second Book of Maccabees, vii. 28, and appears again in an early Christian writing, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, Visions I. 1. — 'God, who dwelleth in the heavens, and created out of nothing the things which are . . .'

Material simply appears—it is created'<sup>1</sup>. A statement like this is full of weaknesses; to say that something comes from nothing or nowhere is not science at all, for the scientific dictum is: *ex nihilo nihil fit* 'nothing comes from nothing', and to equate a thing's appearance with its creation is to confuse the language of science and religion. In this region of ultimate data scientific theory has reached its limit; it can neither pronounce whether new matter is self-existing nor that it is created, and if religion affirms that 'It is by faith that we understand that the world was fashioned by the Word of God, and thus the visible was made out of the invisible'<sup>2</sup>, it is not for science to endorse or deny it—the question is beyond the scope of its method.

The traditional Christian doctrine of a universe beginning and ending with time seems to have the majority support among cosmologists at present. Natural processes are ordinarily considered to have an evolutionary trend, that is, towards increased organization and complexity. But this only holds for the development of life in our immediate surroundings; evolution is a biological theory. In the universe as a whole movement is not by evolution, but by devolution; on the large scale organization is breaking up, and things are passing from the complex to the simple. The evidence of this disintegrating process is perceived by us in the light and heat of stellar bodies, and this radiation is matter in its most rudimentary form. Now if it is supposed that from this elemental matter or free radiation there started a substance-building process, science is unable adequately to describe it; devolution by radiation is irreversible. Science will either have to take an organized universe for granted, or else assume an external cause of cosmic beginnings: 'everything points with overwhelming force to a definite event, or series of events, of creation at some time or times, not infinitely remote.'<sup>3</sup>

Modern theories of the universe are not unsympathetic to the place of Christ in the Christian doctrine of creation. As the

<sup>1</sup>F. Hoyle, *The Nature of the Universe*, p. 105.

<sup>2</sup>Heb. xi.3 (Moffatt); 'the visible came forth from the invisible' (N.E.B.).

<sup>3</sup>J. Jeans, *Eos*, p. 55. Cf. Appendix C on Modern Cosmology and Creation.

outgoing, expressed divine Word or Reason, He is the Agent of God's creative, sustaining and ordering action in the world<sup>1</sup>. How did the first generation of Christians ever come to ascribe a role of such stupendous meaning to One who had appeared on earth in their day? There is but one sufficient explanation, and it lies in that experience which found its theological interpretation in belief in the Trinity. As we shall see, redemption is also creation—the indwelling Christ in communicating God's saving grace operates creatively; in Him man has entered the new order under the New Covenant, and has become an original creation. For Pauline thought creation is not a cosmological theory; it is a fact of experience. Christ's place and work in the universe are simply an extension of His regenerating effect in the faithful soul.

'And in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.' The Apostolic Church affirmed 'there is but one God<sup>2</sup>, and within the unity of the Godhead there are three distinct Persons.<sup>3</sup> The Father is God<sup>4</sup>, the Son is God<sup>5</sup>, and the Holy Spirit is God<sup>6</sup>. The title 'Trinity' is not a biblical one; it first occurs in the Church author Tertullian<sup>7</sup>, and is as distinctive among divine names as the reasons which required the formulation of such a conception of God.

Why did the Church not keep to the belief in God which it inherited from Judaism? What led it from the idea of God as a Monad (unity without distinction) to that of a Triad (unity with distinctions)?

Momentous changes like this do not just happen; there are compelling reasons behind them, and it is most important that we should understand those reasons. At the outset, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that although the word Trinity is not found in the New Testament the foundation of the doctrine is solidly laid there. They are mistaken who suppose that it was

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Jn. i.3; Col. i.16f; I Cor. viii.6.

<sup>2</sup>Jas. ii.19; I Cor. viii.6.

<sup>3</sup>Matt. iii.16f; xxviii.19; II Cor. xiii. 14.

<sup>4</sup>Mtt. xi.25; Rom. xv.6.

<sup>5</sup>Jn. i.1,18; Jn.xx.

<sup>6</sup>E.g., lying to the Holy Spirit is lying to God, Acts v. 3, 4.

<sup>7</sup>Adv. Prax. 11.12.

the outcome of philosophic inquiry into the nature of ultimate being, or even the conclusion reached by a conference of theologians trying to harmonize all the statements about God in Scripture. The basis of the belief in a triune Divine Nature lies in believing experience of the saving grace and power of God in Christ, through the fellowship of the Holy Spirit in Christ's Body, the Church<sup>1</sup>. It is an unique experience which was not possible before the Divine economy, or God's way with mankind, was fully unfolded in the Incarnation and the bestowal of the Spirit, nor can it be had elsewhere. So there is no cause for surprise in the fact that the Christian conception of the Trinity stands by itself among the theologies of world-religions: the intellectual interpretation of an exclusive spiritual experience simply led back to a correspondingly peculiar view of the God whose action produced the experience.

Let us turn to a consideration of what the standard account of it, the New Testament, has to say about this starting-point of Trinitarian theology, Christian religious experience. The most concise, and yet the fullest, expression of the estimate of Jesus in the original proclamation of the Gospel is contained in one of the earliest emblems of the Faith, a fish; for the letters of the Greek word for 'fish' (*ICHTHUS*), are the initials of the words in the Greek phrase *I*eous *CH*ristos *THE*ou *UI*os *S*oter: 'Jesus Christ Son of God Saviour'. Only the last of these names, Saviour, is directly connected with our Lord's work, the others refer to His Person and Office. But they reveal that the dominant thought in the earliest understanding of Christ's achievement is that He has wrought salvation; He is pre-eminently Saviour, and this is not unconnected with His divine Sonship. All these names and designations are to be found in the apostolic preaching recorded in Acts, but we are here concerned with one—'Saviour'. St. Peter declared before the Jewish Council that God had raised up and exalted Jesus to be 'a Saviour'<sup>2</sup>; he exhorted the people on the Day of Pentecost to be baptized 'in the Name of Jesus Christ unto the

<sup>1</sup>Ephes. iv. 15f.; Col. ii. 19; I Cor. xii. 27.

<sup>2</sup>Acts v. 31.

remission of sins'<sup>1</sup>; and told their rulers that He is the sole Mediator of salvation; in His Name alone must men be saved<sup>2</sup>. If the Resurrection, which is given such prominence in St. Peter's addresses in the Acts, made the Gospel message possible, it did so as the guarantee of the validity of Christ's atonement, and because it reveals Him as the Bearer of redemption.

In order to see how the saving power made available through Jesus is applied to our case, we turn to St. Paul, the first and supreme interpreter of Christian religious experience. For the Apostle the definition of the believer's calling is 'life in Christ'; he is in Christ, and conversely, Christ is in him; an interpenetration of personalities takes place<sup>3</sup>. St. Paul is so realistic about this relationship between Christ and believers that he thinks of them inclusively as the instrument of Christ's continuing expression in the world; they comprise His new Body, the Church<sup>4</sup>. Union with Christ begins with reception into the faithful community when we 'were baptized into Christ'; we then died to sin, put on Christ, and rose with Him to newness of life<sup>5</sup>. So deep and intense is St. Paul's sense of the inner presence of Christ that he feels He has taken possession of Him; it is no longer he who lives, but the Christ who dwells in him<sup>6</sup>.

Through the life hidden with Christ in God, the Apostle found the solution to the problem that engaged the best minds of his day, namely, how to attain the mastery of self and circumstance, and live the full, fear-free life. When he claims: 'I know how to be abased, and I know also how to abound: in everything and in all things have I learned the secret both to be filled and to be hungry, both to abound and to be in want. I can do all things in Him that strengtheneth me'<sup>7</sup>, he has realized the ideal of Stoicism, and more, because he could

<sup>1</sup>Acts ii. 38.

<sup>2</sup>Acts iv. 12.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Rom. viii. 2; xvi. 7; II Cor. v. 17.

<sup>4</sup>I Cor. xii. 27; Ephas. iv. 12; Col. i. 18...

<sup>5</sup>Rom. vi. 2, 14; Gal. iii. 27.

<sup>6</sup>Gal. ii. 20.

<sup>7</sup>Phil. iv. 12f. (R.V.).

also declare that for him to die was gain, and this was precisely what no Stoic could say.

This quality of Christian experience is just one of those things that our Lord would have found it unprofitable to try to explain to His disciples during His Ministry; it had to happen before it could be intelligible, and so there is nothing about it in the teaching of Jesus in the first three Gospels. Was it long meditation on the nature of Christian spiritual experience which recalled for St. John the sayings of Jesus about His return to his followers through the sending of the Holy Spirit? Did their verification in the subsequent life of the Church throw a light on words of Jesus, not understood at the time, and cause them to be remembered? Be that as it may, the Fourth Gospel tells us that our Lord assured the disciples that His coming departure would not mean absence from them. On the contrary, the Ascension was the condition of His presence with them in a far more intimate way than was possible before. Jesus' promise to return to the disciples is to some extent fulfilled in the sending of the Spirit<sup>1</sup>. The same equivalence occurs in St. Paul; the Spirit is Christ's Spirit and also God's<sup>2</sup>, and mediates His energizing presence in the faithful soul. To be strengthened with power through the (Father's) Spirit, and to have Christ dwelling in the heart through faith<sup>3</sup>, are merely different descriptions of the same fact. Life in the Spirit and life in Christ are interchangeable states. And by participating in the life of Christ by the indwelling of His Spirit the Christian has all that constitutes salvation, —forgiveness of sins, reconciliation to God, victory over the world, and hope for destiny.

No terms are too strong to express the contrast between the experience of being in Christ and of being without Him. It is the difference between light and darkness<sup>4</sup>, between life and death<sup>5</sup>; in fact, the change from the one state to the other can only be understood as a fresh creative act of God. Man

<sup>1</sup>Jn. xiv.16-20; xvi.7.

<sup>2</sup>Rom. viii.9; Gal. iv.6; Phil. i.19.

<sup>3</sup>Eph. iii.14-17.

<sup>4</sup>Acts xxvi.18; I Pet. ii.9.

<sup>5</sup>I Jn. iii.14.

in Christ, says St. Paul, is a 'new creation'<sup>1</sup>. Christians are 'begotten again'<sup>2</sup>, and Christ is the Second Adam, the progenitor of a new, redeemed race<sup>3</sup>. Creation, absolute and original—for that is what the Pauline phrase means, and not a reconditioning of used materials<sup>4</sup>—is the reverse side of salvation. But the truth is never forgotten that salvation has its source in God: 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself'<sup>5</sup>.

It is questions arising out of a knowledge of the redeeming grace of God in Christ that go to the heart of Trinitarian theology. How is He to be regarded Who passes through the barriers of the personality, and by right makes His abode within the precincts of the soul? Who is He whose presence brings a sense of sins pardoned, of peace with God, and of a power not our own working within us for righteousness? This is not the relation of an ordinary leader to his followers: imagine anyone speaking of being 'in Socrates' or 'in Confucius', or they in him! By definition both the relation and its effect require Deity for their support. Only He who is the ground of our being, on whom we utterly depend, and Whose claim upon us is complete could properly establish this relationship with us, and the salvation flowing from it is something exclusively ascribed to God. 'The overwhelming sense of divine redemption in Christ led Christians to ascribe absolute Deity to their Redeemer'<sup>6</sup>.

Here is the reason behind the high titles and functions accorded to Jesus in the New Testament: He is 'Lord'<sup>7</sup>, the Logos or Word of God<sup>8</sup>, the Judge of mankind—living and dead<sup>9</sup>, the Power and Wisdom of God<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>II Cor. v.17; Gal. vi.15.

<sup>2</sup>I Pet. i.2, 23.

<sup>3</sup>I Cor. xv.45.

<sup>4</sup>II Cor. v.17—'the old things are passed away'.

<sup>5</sup>II Cor. v.19.

<sup>6</sup>Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought*, p.xxii.

<sup>7</sup>Acts ii.36; Phil. ii.11; Rom. xiv.9.

<sup>8</sup>Jn.i.14.

<sup>9</sup>Acts x.42; xvii.31; Jn. v.22.

<sup>10</sup>I Cor. i.24.



It must be underlined that it is the sufficiency of Christ's atoning work, perceived in the enjoyment of its benefits in believing experience through His indwelling presence by the Holy Spirit, that forms the basis and motive of the Christian doctrine of God. In modern terms we should say that the Saviour and the Sanctifier have each the value of God for the soul, and it is only expressing this in another way to affirm that both have a place in ultimate Being, the Godhead.

The doctrine of the Trinity of Persons in unity of substance was thus based primarily on the experience of the first disciples. They found that Jesus claimed an unique intimacy with God<sup>1</sup>, and later died for His claim to be the Son of God<sup>2</sup>. He also spoke of the Holy Spirit as divine yet distinct from Himself<sup>3</sup>, and when they experienced the Spirit's power they knew that He could be no less than God. Hence, though the doctrine of the Trinity is not formally stated in the New Testament, it is implicit in the Apostolic teaching and experience, and becomes a reality in the experience of every faithful member of the Church.

## Article II

### OF THE WORD, OR SON OF GOD, WHICH WAS MADE VERY MAN<sup>4</sup>

The Son, which is the Word of the Father, *begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father*, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.

<sup>1</sup>Matt. xi. 25-27.

<sup>2</sup>Mk. xiv.61.

<sup>3</sup>Jn. xiv.16; xv.26.

<sup>4</sup>The words in italics were inserted in 1563 from the Confession of Württemberg.

THIS Article, derived mainly from the *Augsburg Confession* through the Thirteen Articles, is carefully framed to preserve the truth against heresies concerning the Nature and Person of Christ. Many of those heresies originated in the early centuries of the Church's life, and are often called after their originators<sup>1</sup>, but they are sometimes repeated in modern times.

The Article may be considered under four main assertions:

(1) Christ is the eternal Son of God '*begotten from everlasting . . . of one substance with the Father*'. This declaration is directed against Arianism and all who, like Arius, say there was a time when the Son did not exist<sup>2</sup>. Whereas Article I is concerned with the distinctions in the Godhead, and of the relation of the Son and the Holy Spirit to the Father, this Article treats primarily of the Son's relation to the world. The most general way in which Christians think of Christ is that He is the Mediator, the Agent in God's contact with the world: God acts through Him in creating<sup>3</sup> and giving cohesion to the universe, and He brings salvation. Now the intellectual atmosphere of early Christianity was full of ideas of intermediary powers and principles<sup>4</sup>, and by far the most widespread and important of these was *Logos*, the Greek term for 'Word' or 'expressed reason'. In view of what the Church believed about Christ, no more fitting name could have been applied to Him. He was the Mediator *par excellence*; all that had been ascribed to the old intermediaries, and more, was found in Him. Later Christian thinkers made great use of the *Logos*-idea in discussing the significance of Christ, but it does not occur in the New Testament outside the Johannine writings. No canonical writer alludes so frequently to Christ's mediatorial function as St. Paul, and yet he never once refers to Him as

<sup>1</sup>E.G., Nestorianism, called after Nestorius, who was condemned for teaching that there were two distinct persons in Christ.

<sup>2</sup>Condemned at Council of Nicaea. The Article is also relevant as an answer to Jehovah's Witnesses who relegate Jesus to the status of a 'creature'.

<sup>3</sup>Jn. i.3; Col. i.16. (R. V.).

<sup>4</sup>I Cor. viii.5. 6.

'the Word'. The Apostle distrusted the wisdom of the world and avoided its terminology; the Christ of the inner life is the dominant factor for him. In the classical New Testament passage for the designation of Christ as the Word, St. John i. 1-14, the central thought of the Article is plainly stated, 'the Word' or only-begotten Son 'became flesh, and dwelt among us'. The intermediaries of contemporary philosophy were abstractions, and through the Christian use of it the venerable term 'Logos' was personalized and enriched by its identification with the Son.

At the human level the relation between father and son is expressed by 'begotten'; the father 'begets' his son; and since the terms 'Father' and 'Son' are employed to denote the First and Second Persons in the Trinity, it is inevitable that we should conceive of the relationship between them in this way. But the human analogy is utterly inadequate to indicate the relations in the Godhead. We are in the realm of mystery when discussing this subject, and the inadequacy of human language to describe conditions in ultimate Reality is to be expected. The religious attitude of awe and wonder is appropriate here, not the quest for rational comprehension. It must always be realized that the definition of the Divine Nature was not a problem which the Church's theologians set themselves; it grew step by step as one opinion after another, incompatible with the faith and religion of the New Testament, appeared and had to be resisted, until the Church's mind was eventually expressed in the decisions of the Councils of Nicaea (A.D. 325) and Chalcedon (A.D. 451).

The Father-Son relation in the Godhead must be exclusive and without parallel; in St. John's words, the Son is *monogenes*, 'only begotten'<sup>1</sup>, or as the Apostles' Creed has it, He is God's 'unique' (*unicus*) Son. May we venture to think of it in this way—If love is the quality of the inner life of the Godhead, with the Father as Lover and the Son the Beloved<sup>2</sup>, that

<sup>1</sup>Jn. i.14, 18; iii.16; I Jn. iv.9.

<sup>2</sup>Ephes. i.6.

love is expressed in the eternal generation of the Son<sup>1</sup>. Creation is due to an overflowing of divine love, for love desires to share its blessedness; as Plato said, the Creator's intention was to make something as like Himself as possible, and we should say that under present conditions the divine purpose in Creation is realized in the fellowship of the Church. But the coming of a world-order made no difference to the constitution and life of the Godhead; the Father did not beget the Son to be the Agent in Creation as certain heretical teaching maintained. If time began with Creation, the Arians would have agreed that there was no time when the Son did not exist, but they also held that He was not co-eternal with the Father; that He had no distinct being before Creation and outside Time: 'there was when the Son was not'. On this view the Son was merely a creature with the rest of creation, which is an unsatisfactory conception of the Person of the Saviour. Hence it became necessary for the Council of Nicaea to affirm in its Creed that the Son was 'of one substance with the Father'<sup>2</sup> to refute the Arian view that the Son had been created out of nothing and had no community of being with the Father. Article II thus follows the Creed in asserting that the Son was generated out of the Father's very substance or being, the implication being that He shared the divine essence to the full. Since He is of the same substance as the Father, He is not in any sense inferior to the Father.

(2) The Article then affirms that Jesus was born of a Virgin. Since He is the eternal Son of God, His birth in Bethlehem at a particular time in history was not the beginning of His existence, but only his entry into human life. From the Virgin Mary He received His human nature, without the intervention of a human father. Various attempts have been made to cast doubts on this belief, mainly on the grounds that it is not well authenticated in the New Testament, and may have been derived from similar legends in other religions. But the silence of St. Mark and St. Paul may be due to natural reticence to

<sup>1</sup>Jn. xvii.24.

<sup>2</sup>This clause in the original Greek text of the Creed means literally 'of the same substance as the Father'.

discuss such an intimate matter. Possible allusions to it have been found in three of the Gospels<sup>1</sup>. St. Luke has been proved to be an accurate writer, and it is incredible that he should have deliberately given a false account of the Nativity, after saying that he had accurately traced all things from the very first, and wrote 'that thou mightest know the certainty of those things'. The alleged parallels in other religions are not so impressive when examined<sup>2</sup>. Even though human life normally comes into existence by the union of male and female, it does not follow that the Son of God (Who existed before Creation) could enter human life only by means of such a union. Belief in the Virgin Birth was widely accepted by the time of Ignatius<sup>3</sup> (c. A.D. 110) and 'everything we know of the dogmatics of the early part of the 2nd century agrees with the belief that at that period the virginity of Mary was a part of the formulated Christian belief'<sup>4</sup>. In addition to the evidence of Ignatius and the Gospel allusions already mentioned, the clause on the supernatural birth is found in the earliest form of the Apostles' Creed—the Old Roman Creed—which was probably a statement of belief required of candidates for Baptism and dates from about the middle of the second century.

In this way there were joined in the Person of Christ two natures, the human derived from the Virgin Mother and the divine by the action of the Spirit; it was an indissoluble union, the natures were '*never to be divided*'. With this conjunction of the divine and human the final work of redemption has begun;

<sup>1</sup>Matt. i.18, 20, 24f.; Lk. i.34f.; Jn. i.14. It has been suggested that Luke i.34, 35 is an interpolation, and that St. Luke had no knowledge of the Virgin Birth. But Dr. Vincent Taylor has shown that the two vital verses are 'thoroughly Lukan, and no suspicion of textual confusion appears'. Dr. Lowther Clarke has drawn attention to the remarkable parallelism of the Annunciations to Mary and to Zacharias—verse 33-17, 34-18, 35-19, 36-20. If St. Luke—or anyone else—interpolated verses 34 and 35, he must also have interpolated verses 18 and 19 to complete the parallelism!

<sup>2</sup>Cf. 'The Virgin Birth and Recent Discussion' in *New Testament Problems*, by W. K. Lowther Clarke.

<sup>3</sup>*Ep. ad Eph. 19, ad Trall. 9, ad Smyrna 1.*

<sup>4</sup>Dr. Rendell Harris, cited in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, S.P.C.K. 1928, p. 319.

now the Seed of the woman is about to bruise the serpent's head<sup>1</sup>.

The Incarnation<sup>2</sup> is the essential condition of salvation. Only by uniting Himself with the object of redemption, humanity, could the Redeemer effect His purpose. And further, although St. Paul thinks of Christ primarily as Saviour, He is also regarded as Consummator; the entire creation, 'the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth'<sup>3</sup>, is to be summed up in Him. In what way is this conceivable except by His Incarnation?

Modern knowledge enables us to have a far deeper apprehension of Christ as cosmic Consummator than was possible in the first century. Even if the theory of evolution is accepted in its most rigorous form, so that from the atoms in a nebula to man there has been a continuous development, one state issuing from the preceding one and passing into the next without a break anywhere, this means that in a real sense the whole world-order gathered up in man. Were the universe to perish to-morrow nothing of worth would be lost, for its true nature is conserved for ever through the Incarnation of the Word.

(3) It follows from the preceding statements that if Jesus was '*of one substance with the Father*' and was born of the Virgin '*of her substance*', then in Him '*the Godhead and Manhood were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man*'.

The New Testament writers plainly declare the deity of Christ. They record the voice from heaven that declared Him to be the Son of God at His Baptism<sup>4</sup> and again at His Transfiguration<sup>5</sup>. They support that declaration with the testimony of Jesus Himself<sup>6</sup>, and of John the Baptist<sup>7</sup>, the

<sup>1</sup>Gen. iii.15.

<sup>2</sup>The technical term to describe the embodiment in flesh (Latin, *in carna*) of the Son of God, cf. Jn. i.14.

<sup>3</sup>Eph. i.10.

<sup>4</sup>Matt. iii.17; Mk. i.11.

<sup>5</sup>Mk. ix.7; Lk. ix.35.

<sup>6</sup>Mk. xiv. 16f.; Jn. v.17ff.; xvii.1, et.al.

<sup>7</sup>Jn. i.34.

disciples<sup>1</sup>, and even evil spirits<sup>2</sup>. St. Paul asserted that 'in Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead'<sup>3</sup>, and the Apostolic Church had no doubt about His Divine Nature<sup>4</sup>.

But it is equally evident that He was also perfectly human. He grew and developed in body, mind and soul<sup>5</sup>. He displayed human emotions such as sorrow<sup>6</sup>, sympathy<sup>7</sup>, astonishment<sup>8</sup>, anger<sup>9</sup>, and experienced hunger<sup>10</sup>, thirst<sup>11</sup>, and weariness<sup>12</sup>. He was in all points tempted like as we are<sup>13</sup>, He experienced all the desires common to us<sup>14</sup>, and His knowledge appears to have been limited for He sometimes asked questions to obtain information<sup>15</sup>.

At first sight it may appear that these two sets of facts are contradictory. For instance, God is omniscient, we cannot imagine His knowledge as being limited in any way. Hence, if Jesus possessed 'all the fulness of the Godhead' we would expect Him to be omniscient too; how then do we explain His apparent limitations? In short, how *could* He be Son of God and also perfectly human? It was in attempting to answer this question that many ancient writers fell into heresy. Possibly the simplest explanation is to follow St. Paul's suggestion that Jesus 'emptied Himself'<sup>16</sup>. When he came down to earth He laid aside His glory, but not His Godhead. In order to have a real and complete human experience He willed

<sup>1</sup>Mtt. xiv.33; Jn. vi.69.

<sup>2</sup>Lk. iv.41.

<sup>3</sup>Col. ii.9.

<sup>4</sup>Jn. i.1, 18; Rom. viii.3; I Cor. i.9; Phil. ii.6; Heb. i.

<sup>5</sup>Lk. ii.40, 52; Heb. v.7-9.

<sup>6</sup>Mk. xiv.33f.

<sup>7</sup>Jn. xi.33.

<sup>8</sup>Mk. vi.6; Lk. vii.9.

<sup>9</sup>Mk. iii.5.

<sup>10</sup>Mtt. iv.2.

<sup>11</sup>Jn. iv.7ff.

<sup>12</sup>Mk. iv.38.

<sup>13</sup>Heb. iv.15; ii.18; Lk. iv.2.

<sup>14</sup>There is therefore nothing inherently sinful in our natural desires; only the over indulgence or abuse of them is sinful. For instance thirst is a natural desire, but if over indulged it can lead to drunkenness. 'For whatsoever is naturally in us, is naturally in Him; but a man is not a man without natural desires; therefore these were in Him, in Him without sin; and therefore so in us without sin'—Jeremy Taylor, *A Further Explication of the Doctrine of Original Sin*. VI. 30.

<sup>15</sup>Mk. ix.21; Jn. xi.34; cf. Mk. xiii.32.

<sup>16</sup>Phil. ii.5-8.

that His divine knowledge might be restrained, so that He might fully share the normal human experience of growing 'in wisdom and stature'<sup>1</sup>.

(4) Finally, the Article affirms the reality and purpose of our Lord's death and passion, that He '*truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.*'

In the Greek culture in which Christianity spread, the remoteness of the divine Nature from earthly conditions was the prevailing idea; physical existence was despised, the body was regarded as 'the tomb of the soul', to escape from which was salvation. With an intellectual background like this the conception of a God-Man was extremely difficult; it was unthinkable that a divine Being should undergo the privations, sorrows and sufferings of our mortal lot. Yet the Christian tradition of the life of Jesus contained in the Gospels presents Him as pre-eminently the Man of Sorrows. Heresy appears to have originated in an attempt to solve the problem by denying the human side of Christ's Person—a tendency which is not unknown in our own day and generation, though, perhaps for different reasons. Jesus, it was suggested, was immune against our common temptations and infirmities; He only 'seemed' to suffer and die, but did not really, and the Gospel evidence for such things was the account of a huge pretence. Already towards the end of the first century this teaching was considered the arch-enemy of the Faith, the very spirit of Anti-Christ<sup>2</sup>, and it is against it that the Article asserts that Christ '*truly (vere) suffered, was crucified, dead and buried*'.

An interesting question, at one time much debated, is whether the Word would have assumed our humanity had there been no sin in the world. If man had always acted according to the law of his being and been obedient to God's

<sup>1</sup>Luke ii.52. 'The omniscience of God does not mean that it is incapable of limitation, but rather that, with more power than finitude has, it is also more capable of limitation. Only it is self-limitation: He limits Himself in the freedom of holiness for the purposes of His own end of infinite love.' P. T. Forsyth, *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, (1909), p. 311.

<sup>2</sup>I John iv.2.

will for him, would the Incarnation still have happened? Since the world was created in God's love, and it is the nature of love to seek the closest contact possible with its object, it would seem to follow that the Incarnation is implied by the divine character. But in fact the Incarnation is everywhere in the New Testament associated with sin and its remedy, as Article II asserts. 'For God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world; but that the world should be saved through Him'<sup>1</sup>; in such words the uniform teaching of the New Testament on the purpose of Christ's coming is concisely expressed. In the words of the Article, 'He is *'to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men'*. It will be noticed, however, that the Article reverses the regular scriptural phrase; St. Paul speaks of our being reconciled to the Father, never the Father to us<sup>2</sup>. No doubt the words of the Article are aimed at the Socinian heresy which held that there was no reaction in God against sinners; no divine wrath to be met by Christ's atonement. But the truth is that being under the wrath of God is an outstanding feature of the human situation in the New Testament, and deliverance from it is one great result of the saving work of Christ<sup>3</sup>. The death of Christ is a sacrifice<sup>4</sup>, and a propitiation<sup>5</sup> both for original guilt, that is, the innate evil tendency within us, and also for the particular sins in which it issues.

Two things are necessary for right thinking about the Death of Christ as a sacrifice. First, it is the sacrifice of a person, and therefore is on a different plane from animal sacrifice; and secondly, it must be seen as the decisive test of obedience to the Father's will<sup>6</sup>. It is in the Death itself, as the demonstration of utter dedication and absolute commitment, and not in the form it takes that its sacrificial character lies.

This quality of Christ's sacrifice also relates to the fundamental need of humanity, the conquest of sin, which

<sup>1</sup>Jn. iii.17. (R.V.)

<sup>2</sup>Rom. v.10; Eph. ii.16; II Cor. v.18f.; Col. i.20.

<sup>3</sup>Jn. iii.36; Rom. i.18, v.9; Eph. ii.3, v.6; I Thess. i.10, ii.16.

<sup>4</sup>Eph. v.2; Heb. ix.26.

<sup>5</sup>Rom. iii.25; I Jn. ii.2, iv.10.

<sup>6</sup>Phil. ii.8.

St. John says is 'lawlessness' or disobedience. Its disobedience is what is radically wrong with the human race, and from which it requires to be redeemed.

St. Paul in an important passage contrasts Adam's disobedience and its consequences with Christ's obedience and its effect: 'For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous.'<sup>1</sup> Christ's life of perfect obedience to the divine will and the death on the Cross belong together; in a fallen world like ours the one leads to the other<sup>2</sup>: the Cross is not an arbitrary demand of God.

The New Testament represents Christ's atoning death, so necessary for human salvation<sup>3</sup>, as the fruit of God's love toward us<sup>4</sup>, effecting perfectly what ancient sacrifices could only do imperfectly<sup>5</sup>; purging from guilt and cancelling condemnation<sup>6</sup>; averting wrath and opening the way for mercy<sup>7</sup>; a most powerful incentive to repentance and a life of sacrifice and service<sup>8</sup>; effecting our redemption from wrath<sup>9</sup>, from the power of sin<sup>10</sup>, from bondage to Satan<sup>11</sup>, from the tyranny of the evil world<sup>12</sup>, and from the effects of sin in death<sup>13</sup>. Through the death of Christ, the lives of men and their relationship with God have been transformed. They have found peace with God<sup>14</sup>, forgiveness of sins<sup>15</sup>, experienced new life<sup>16</sup> and a capacity for righteousness<sup>17</sup> and fellowship with God<sup>18</sup>. That such experience is no mere figment of the

<sup>1</sup>Rom. v.19.

<sup>2</sup>I Cor. ii.8.

<sup>3</sup>Heb. ix.22f.

<sup>4</sup>Rom. v.8; I Jn. iv.10.

<sup>5</sup>Heb. ix.9-16.

<sup>6</sup>Rom. viii.; I Jn. i.7; Rev. i.5.

<sup>7</sup>Heb. ii.17; I Jn. ii.2.

<sup>8</sup>Rom. vi.1ff.; I Cor. vi.20.

<sup>9</sup>Rom. v.9.

<sup>10</sup>Rom. vi.6; viii.2.

<sup>11</sup>Heb. ii.14.

<sup>12</sup>Gal. i.4; I Pet. i.18.

<sup>13</sup>I Cor. xv.20ff.

<sup>14</sup>Rom. v.1.

<sup>15</sup>I Jn. iv.10.

<sup>16</sup>I Pet. ii.24; Rom. vi.3-11.

<sup>17</sup>I Cor. vi.9-11.

<sup>18</sup>Ephes. ii.12-19.

imagination, is proved by the changed conduct and amazing spirit of fellowship in the Christian community<sup>1</sup>. Reconciliation with God promotes reconciliation with our fellowmen, for faith without works is dead<sup>2</sup>.

### Article III

#### OF THE GOING DOWN OF CHRIST INTO HELL<sup>3</sup>

As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also it is to be believed that He went down into hell (*ad inferos descendisse*).

Christ died on Good Friday, His body was buried and remained in the grave until His Resurrection, but where was His soul during that period? The Article, like the Apostles' Creed, merely affirms that '*He went down into hell*'. Unfortunately, the word 'hell' is often misunderstood, because it is used in the Authorized Version to translate two different Greek words—*gehenna* which means the place of torment, and *hades* which is the equivalent of the Hebrew word *sheol*, meaning 'the place of departed souls'. By the 'descent into hell' we mean that our Lord's soul went on Good Friday to 'the place of departed spirits' where the souls of all men go at death to await the resurrection.

The *fact* of His descent into Hades is undisputed and is clearly taught in Acts ii. 27, 31, where St. Peter interprets the words of Psalm xvi. 10 as being fulfilled in Christ, explaining that the Psalmist 'foreseeing this, spake of the Resurrection of Christ, that neither was He left in Hades nor did His flesh see corruption' (R.V.). Thus St. Peter obviously believed that

<sup>1</sup>Acts ii.42-47.

<sup>2</sup>Jas. ii.14ff.; Mtt. xxv.31ff.

<sup>3</sup>The original Article of 1553 as written by Cranmer included the words: 'For the body lay in the sepulchre until the Resurrection; but His ghost departing from Him, was with the ghosts that were in prison, or in hell, and did preach to the same as the place of St. Peter doth testify' (a reference to I Pet. iii.18, lv.6). But this clause was omitted at the revision of the Articles in 1563.

Jesus was in Hades between His death and His Resurrection.<sup>1</sup>

But while the fact of His descent is generally accepted, the *purpose* of the Descent has been the subject of controversy. On the one hand, I Peter iii. 18 and iv. 6 have been interpreted as meaning that our Lord's human spirit went to Hades to preach to the souls of the departed. This appears to have been the general view of the Reformers<sup>2</sup>. On the other hand, I Peter iii. 18ff. was seldom used in the Patristic writings as evidence of the descent into Hades<sup>3</sup>, and the idea of Christ 'preaching' to the dead does not appear to have been taught in the Church before A.D. 150<sup>4</sup>. There are weighty reasons for believing that 'the spirits in prison' in I Peter iii. 19 refers not to the dead, but to archetypal spirits of evil.<sup>5</sup> The present Article does not commit us to any particular interpretation of that passage.

The really important point, beyond dispute, is that Christ has shared in every human experience, even in death. Whatever lies before us, He has endured it first and emerged victorious. 'Christ in dying shared to the full our lot. His body was laid in the tomb. His soul passed into that state on which we conceive that our souls shall enter. He has won for God and hallowed every condition of human existence. We cannot be where He has not been. He bore our nature as living; He bore our nature as dead. . . . it carries light into the tomb. But more than this we dare not say confidently on a mystery where our thought fails and Scripture is silent'.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* V.xxxi.1) quotes St. Matt. xii.40 and Ephes. iv.9 as evidence of the Descent; other early writers cite Matt. xii.29; viii.11; Luke xiii.28f.; Col. ii.15; Heb. xi, xii.

<sup>2</sup>As is evidenced by the 1553 Article and by the statement in the Catechism of 1554: 'Then He truly died . . . not only the living but the dead, were they in hell or elsewhere, they all felt the force of His death, to whom lying in prison (as Peter saith), Christ preached, though dead in body, yet re-lived in spirit.' Note also that I Pet. iii.17-22 is the Epistle for Easter Eve in the Prayer Book.

<sup>3</sup>E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of Peter* (1947), p. 340.

<sup>4</sup>E. G. Selwyn, *Op. cit.*, p. 343f.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 353.

<sup>6</sup>B. F. Westcott, *The Historic Faith*, p. 77.

## Article IV

## OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature; wherewith He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day.

This Article was composed by the English Reformers in 1553, and contains five positive assertions:

(1) '*Christ did truly rise again from death*'. Jesus often predicted that He would rise again on the third day<sup>1</sup>, but His disciples did not understand His predictions<sup>2</sup>, and in fact believed that His death was the end of all their hopes<sup>3</sup>. After the Crucifixion they lived in fear<sup>4</sup>, and sadness<sup>5</sup>, and so little were they expecting His resurrection that at first they refused to believe that it could be true<sup>6</sup>. The women who first discovered that He was risen had gone to the tomb with the intention of anointing His dead body<sup>7</sup>. This evidence of the *unexpectedness* of the Resurrection is very important, for it rules out any possibility that the witnesses of the Resurrection were suffering from hallucinations. Men do not imagine what they do not believe or expect.

Proof of the Resurrection rests on the cumulative effect of several lines of evidence:

(a) The number and variety of those who saw the risen Christ—Mary of Magdala and her companions<sup>8</sup>, Simon Peter<sup>9</sup>, Cleopas and his companion<sup>10</sup>, the Ten and others<sup>11</sup>, Thomas and the other Disciples<sup>12</sup>, the Seven by the Sea of

<sup>1</sup>Matt. xvi.21; xvii.23; xx.19; xxvii.63; Mk. viii.31; ix.9; ix.31; x.34; xiv.28, 58; Lk. ix.22; xviii.33; Jn. ii.19-21.

<sup>2</sup>Matt. xvi.22; Mk. ix.32; Lk. xviii.34.

<sup>3</sup>Lk. xxiv. 21.

<sup>4</sup>Jn. xix.38; xx.19.

<sup>5</sup>Lk. xxiv.17.

<sup>6</sup>Mk. xvi.11; Lk.xxiv.22; Jn. xx.25.

<sup>7</sup>Mk. xvi.1ff.

<sup>8</sup>Matt. xxviii.1-10; Mk. xvi.1-11; Lk. xxiv.1-12; Jn. xx.1-18.

<sup>9</sup>Lk. xxiv.34; I Cor. xv.5.

<sup>10</sup>Mk. xvi.12f.; Lk.xxiv.13-35.

<sup>11</sup>Lk. xxiv.36-43; Jn. xx.19-21; I Cor. xv.5.

<sup>12</sup>Jn. xx.26-28.

Galilee<sup>1</sup>, the Eleven on the Mountain<sup>2</sup>, 'above five hundred brethren'<sup>3</sup>, James<sup>4</sup>, the Eleven before the Ascension<sup>5</sup>. After the Ascension Jesus was also seen to be alive by Stephen<sup>6</sup>, Saul of Tarsus<sup>7</sup>, and the Apostle John<sup>8</sup>. Perhaps the most important of all these witnesses is Saul of Tarsus, for no evidence is more convincing than that of a zealous Jew who was determined to stamp out Christianity, yet the evidence of his own senses compelled him to realize that Jesus was alive—which could only mean that what the Christians said about the Resurrection must be true.<sup>9</sup>

(b) All the Evangelists record that the tomb was empty<sup>10</sup> on the morning after the Jewish Sabbath.<sup>11</sup> There are differences of detail in the accounts of what took place on the first Easter morning. But that is to be expected in the testimony of independent witnesses; if the accounts were identically the same we would suspect that they derived from a single source, or were even the result of deliberate collusion. The differences between the four accounts are no greater than we find between Press reports of a particular current event—different witnesses record their own impressions, and some give details omitted by others, but the main facts are the same.

The *fact* that the tomb was empty on Easter morning must be explained.

Either Jesus rose from the dead *or* someone rolled away the huge stone of the tomb that was sealed and guarded,<sup>12</sup> and took

<sup>1</sup>Jn. xxi.1-23.

<sup>2</sup>Mtt. xxviii.16-20; Mk. xvi.15ff.

<sup>3</sup>I Cor. xv.6.

<sup>4</sup>I Cor. xv.7.

<sup>5</sup>Mk. xvi.19f.; Lk. xxiv.50-52; Acts i.4-11; I Cor. xv.7.

<sup>6</sup>Acts vii.55f.

<sup>7</sup>Acts ix.3-9; (I Cor. ix.1, xv.8); Acts xviii.9f.

<sup>8</sup>Rev. i.10-17.

<sup>9</sup>Lord Lyttelton and his friend Gilbert West left Oxford University at the close of one academic year, each determining to give attention respectively during the Long Vacation to the Conversion of St. Paul and the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, in order to prove the baselessness of both. They met again in the autumn and compared experiences. Lord Lyttelton had become convinced of the truth of St. Paul's conversion, and Gilbert West of the Resurrection of Christ', Griffith Thomas, *Principles of Theology*, p. 79f.

<sup>10</sup>Mtt. xxviii.6; Mk. xvi.6; Lk. xxiv.3; Jn. xx.2-9.

<sup>11</sup>Mtt. xxviii.1; Mk. xvi.1; Jn. xx.1.

<sup>12</sup>Matt. xxvii.62-66.

His dead body from the tomb. If the Jews did so, they had only to produce the dead body to refute the preaching of the Apostles, but no body was ever produced. It is incredible that the soldiers should have stolen the body which they had been ordered to guard. The fact that the Jews tried to make people believe that the disciples had stolen the body<sup>1</sup>, is further proof that the tomb was empty, but it fails to explain the subsequent life of the disciples. Men do not readily endure persecution and death to perpetuate a falsehood. The suggestion that Jesus was not really dead but only swooned on the Cross is contrary to the evidence that the soldiers did not break His legs for they 'saw that He was dead already'<sup>2</sup>. Furthermore, if He only swooned, when did He finally die? The piercing of His side made doubly sure that He did not remain alive.<sup>3</sup>

(c) The *fact* that a great change took place in the disciples must be accounted for. The fear<sup>4</sup> and sadness<sup>5</sup> which characterized them after the Crucifixion was transformed into fearless boldness<sup>6</sup> and gladness<sup>7</sup>. The Resurrection of Jesus accounts adequately for their transformation; no other adequate explanation has been offered. 'Jesus and the Resurrection' was the main theme of the Apostolic preaching<sup>8</sup>. Were the Apostles deliberately propagating a deceitful lie? Such a suggestion does not bear close scrutiny. 'Nothing was easier than to subject them to cross-examination, as indeed the Acts tells us was done. Is it likely that these simple-minded provincials would have consistently maintained their position throughout a cross-examination, if their *bona fides* had not been beyond reproach? Peter, we are told, broke down and lost his nerve at a sudden question from a maid servant. Judas Iscariot's defection would surely have been followed by the defection

<sup>1</sup>Mtt. xxviii.11-15.

<sup>2</sup>Jn. xix.33.

<sup>3</sup>Jn. xix.34.

<sup>4</sup>Jn. xix.38; xx.19.

<sup>5</sup>Jn. xx.11; Lk. xxiv.17.

<sup>6</sup>Acts iv.13, 19f.; v.27-29.

<sup>7</sup>Lk. xxiv.41; Jn. xx.20; Acts ii.46.

<sup>8</sup>Acts xvii.18, cf. ii.32, 36; iii.15; v.30, 32; x.40f.; xiii.30; xvii.31; xxvi.23; 1 Cor. xv.1-9.

of others had there been an uneasy conscience anywhere among the disciples.<sup>1</sup>

(d) The *fact* that the Christian Church observes 'the first day of the week'<sup>2</sup> as the distinctively Christian day of worship, instead of the seventh day of the week (the Jewish Sabbath). Why did the first day of the week become the Christian day of worship, if it was not in commemoration of the Resurrection? In the distinctively Christian service, 'the breaking of bread', Christians do not commemorate a dead Master, but have communion with a Living Lord, and Baptism loses much of its significance if Christ did not rise from the dead<sup>3</sup>. How did Sunday and the two Sacraments of the Gospel come to be so closely linked with the Resurrection of Christ if no resurrection took place?

(2) He '*took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature*'. This statement is obviously based on St. Luke xxiv. 39. The Article must therefore be interpreted in accordance with the Scripture passage on which it is based, and the latter must be understood in its context. Jesus appeared so suddenly to the disciples that 'they were terrified and affrighted and supposed that they had seen a spirit.' In order to convince them that they had not seen a ghost Jesus said, 'Handle Me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me having' (R.V.). When He saw that they 'still disbelieved'<sup>4</sup> He asked for some food and ate it before them. But it does not necessarily follow that His resurrection-body was therefore in no respect different from His natural body. 'The alternative—"either a ghost, or an ordinary body needing food"—is false. There is a third possibility: a glorified body, capable of receiving food. Is there any deceit in taking food which one does not want, in order to place others, who are needing it, at their ease?'<sup>5</sup> Our Lord's purpose was to emphasize that His Resurrection was an objective reality, and to assure the disciples that they were

<sup>1</sup>W. K. Lowther Clarke, *New Testament Problems*, 1929, p. 106.

<sup>2</sup>Acts xx.7; 1 Cor. xvi.2; cf. Mk. xvi.1; Jn. xx.1.

<sup>3</sup>Rom. vi.4.

<sup>4</sup>Lk. xxiv.41 (R.V.).

<sup>5</sup>A. Plummer, *International Critical Commentary, St. Luke*, p. 560.



not merely seeing a ghost. But His resurrection-body was a glorified body which was not subject to the limitations of our human bodies. At will, He could make Himself known<sup>1</sup> or unknown<sup>2</sup>, He could appear<sup>3</sup> and disappear<sup>4</sup> without warning and within closed doors.<sup>5</sup> Yet though His body was glorified, continuity was preserved with His natural body<sup>6</sup>. The Article was intended to refute an Anabaptist error that after the Resurrection our Lord's humanity was absorbed into His divinity. It asserts that He rose and ascended with 'all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature.'

(3) 'Wherewith He ascended into heaven'. Immediately we begin to discuss the life after death we are faced with the inadequacy of language.<sup>7</sup> Every word which we use in speech or writing has a definite meaning associated with this earth, and is therefore totally inadequate to describe a different mode of existence. Hence we can only describe our Lord's Ascension with the aid of metaphors and symbols. In this age of Earth Satellites and Moon Rockets it is important to remember the limitations of language when we speak of 'going up' to heaven. 'We are not to think of the Ascension of Christ as of a change of position, of a going immeasurably far from us. It is rather a change of the mode of existence, a passing to God, of Whom we cannot say that He is 'there' rather than 'here', of Whom we all can say 'God is with me', and if God then Christ Who has ascended to the right hand of God. When therefore we declare our belief in Christ's Ascension, we declare that He has entered upon the completeness of spiritual being without

<sup>1</sup>Matt. xxviii.10; Mk. xvi.12; Lk. xxiv. 31; Jn. xx.16.

<sup>2</sup>Lk. xxiv.15f.; Jn. xx.14f.

<sup>3</sup>Mtt. xxviii.9; Mk. xvi.14; Lk. xxiv.36; Jn. xx.14, 19.

<sup>4</sup>Lk. xxiv.31.

<sup>5</sup>Jn. xx.19, 26. 'Our Lord returned to the Father not as He came, but for ever united with human nature, the Word made Flesh. But the Resurrection had placed the flesh of the Word so far under the control of the Spirit that His body as the Gospels show, was, even before the Ascension, independent, when He so willed, of the laws that govern matter', H. B. Swete, *The Ascended Christ*, p. 8.

<sup>6</sup>'While there was the glorifying of His Body to which the narratives testify, there was also the continuity of the whole manhood, body and spirit, raised from death. The Son of God took upon Him the whole of human nature (often in the New Testament the word "flesh" is so used) in order that the whole might be raised in glory', A. M. Ramsey, *The Resurrection of Christ*, 1945, p. 103f.

<sup>7</sup>Note the variations of language used to describe the Ascended Lord in I Pet. iii.22; Acts i.11; Ephes. i.20; Heb. vii.26; Ephes. iv.10 (R.V.); Heb. iv.14

lessening in any degree the completeness of His Humanity'.<sup>1</sup>

The Gospels are primarily concerned with our Lord's earthly life and only refer incidentally to the Ascension.<sup>2</sup> Some such event was necessary to indicate that the post-Resurrection appearances were not to continue indefinitely. But the writers of the Acts and Epistles emphasize its greater significance as God's exaltation of Christ<sup>3</sup> and His coronation<sup>4</sup>. He is now 'King of Kings and Lord of Lords'.<sup>5</sup> Much of the Epistle to the Hebrews is concerned with the High Priestly life of the Ascended Lord.<sup>6</sup> 'His presence in the Holiest is a perpetual and effective presentation before God of the sacrifice once offered . . . He offers Himself as representing to God man reconciled, and as claiming for man the right of access to the Divine presence.'<sup>7</sup> His Ascension was 'expedient'<sup>8</sup> for all His disciples, for His new position of authority and power enables them to do 'greater works'<sup>9</sup> through His grace and abiding Presence<sup>10</sup> with them.

(4) 'And there sitteth'. As in the Creeds, the language is metaphorical<sup>11</sup> and means that the Ascended Lord has been raised to the position of supreme authority and power<sup>12</sup>. Though He is described as 'sitting' He is not inactive. He shares all the experiences of the Church, even in persecution<sup>13</sup>. He bestows the gift of the Holy Spirit<sup>14</sup>. He is our Mediator<sup>15</sup>, Intercessor<sup>16</sup>, and Advocate<sup>17</sup> with the Father.

<sup>1</sup>B. F. Westcott, *The Historic Faith*, p. 80f.

<sup>2</sup>Mk. xvi.19; Lk. xxiv.51; Jn. iii.13; vi.62; xiii.3; xiv.2ff., xvi.5, 7, 16.

<sup>3</sup>Phil. ii.9.

<sup>4</sup>Heb. ii.9; I Cor. xv.25.

<sup>5</sup>Rev. xix.16.

<sup>6</sup>Heb. iv.14f.; v.10; viii.

<sup>7</sup>H. B. Swete, *Op. Cit.*, p. 43; cf. Heb. vii.26f.

<sup>8</sup>Jn. xvi.7.

<sup>9</sup>Jn. xiv.12, cf. Acts ii.33, Ephes. iv.8.

<sup>10</sup>Mtt. xxviii.20; xviii.19f.

<sup>11</sup>The symbolism is borrowed from Ps. cx.1, which had been cited by our Lord (Mk. xii.36) and was used by St. Peter (Acts ii.34). The early Church accepted the idea (cf. Rom. viii.34; Col. iii.1; Heb. i.3; viii.1; x.12; xii.2).

<sup>12</sup>Ephes. i.20-23 (R.V.), cp. Matt. xxviii.18.

<sup>13</sup>The Acts ix.4f. 'Why persecutest thou Me?' i.e., persecution of the Church is persecution of Christ.

<sup>14</sup>Acts ii.33.

<sup>15</sup>Heb. viii.6, etc.

<sup>16</sup>Rom. viii.34.

<sup>17</sup>Jn. ii.1.

(5) 'Until He return to judge all men at the last day'. Belief in a future 'Day of the Lord' which would bring vindication to the righteous and condemnation to the wicked was familiar to our Lord's contemporaries and to all who read the Jewish Bible.<sup>1</sup> In much of our Lord's teaching about His Return in judgement He used phrases and metaphors that were familiar to His hearers. But He added to contemporary beliefs the idea that He himself would return unexpectedly<sup>2</sup>, 'in glory'<sup>3</sup>, as the Judge<sup>4</sup>, to render to every man according to his deeds<sup>5</sup>. The final Judgement is generally associated with the resurrection to judgement of 'the quick and the dead'<sup>6</sup>. Various conceptions of Judgement are to be found in the New Testament. Some of the Apostles thought it would take place before their deaths<sup>7</sup>. Other writers have suggested that judgement is more of a present process than a future event<sup>8</sup>, though this view is not inconsistent with belief in a final Judgement yet to come.<sup>9</sup> The Article is more explicit than the Creeds, inasmuch as it speaks of the Judgement as taking place 'at the last day'<sup>10</sup>. Belief in a future judgement when we must render account of our lives is a fundamental part of the Gospel.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Amos v.10ff.

<sup>2</sup>Mtt. xxiv.27, 42f.

<sup>3</sup>Mtt. xxv.31-46.

<sup>4</sup>Mtt. xxiv.30f.; Jn. v.22, 25.

<sup>5</sup>Mtt. vii.21; xvi.27; II Cor. v.10.

<sup>6</sup>Acts x.42; Rom. xiv.9f; I Pet. iv.

<sup>7</sup>I Thess. iv.17; I Cor. xv.51; Jn. xxi.22f.

<sup>8</sup>Jn. xii.31.

<sup>9</sup>W. G. Wilson, *Church Teaching*, 1954, p. 51.

<sup>10</sup>Jn. xii.48; Acts xvii.3.

<sup>11</sup>Acts xxiv.25; Rom. ii.15f.; I Cor. iv.5; II Cor. v.10; Heb. vi.2; etc.

## Article V

## OF THE HOLY GHOST

The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

This short Article deals with the nature of the Holy Ghost and His relationship to the Father and the Son. It affirms the deity of the Holy Ghost<sup>1</sup>, that He is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father, 'very and eternal God'.<sup>2</sup> The Apostles believed in the unity of the Godhead<sup>3</sup>, yet the evidence of the New Testament indicates certain inner distinctions between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, which can only be expressed by using the word "Persons". The Holy Spirit is a person, because He works by personal activities such as teaching,<sup>4</sup> making intercession<sup>5</sup>, witnessing,<sup>6</sup> and leading<sup>7</sup>.

'Proceeding from the Father and the Son' is a technical phrase used by St. Augustine to describe the relationship between the Persons in the Godhead. The word 'proceeding' is used as in John xv. 26: 'When the Advocate is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me.' Here, as elsewhere in the New Testament, the Spirit is represented as sent by the Son from the Father. In fact, He is called 'the Spirit of Christ'<sup>8</sup> and 'of Jesus'<sup>9</sup>, as well as the Spirit of God,<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Acts v.3f. (lying to the H.G. is lying to God); Mk. iii.29 (blasphemy against the H.G. is a sin); I Cor. iii.16 (those in whom the Spirit dwells are God's temple, i.e., dwellingplace). This Article was added in 1563 from the Lutheran Confession of Württemberg. It was probably included to complete the statement of Catholic doctrine in Articles I-IV, and to condemn those who followed Arius in regarding the Holy Spirit as the 'creature of a creature'.

<sup>2</sup>Heb. ix.14; He existed before Creation (Gen. i.2).

<sup>3</sup>I Cor. viii.6.

<sup>4</sup>Jn. xiv.26.

<sup>5</sup>Rom. viii.26f.

<sup>6</sup>Jn. xv.26.

<sup>7</sup>Gal. v.18.

<sup>8</sup>Rom. viii.9; Gal. iv.6; Phil. i.19; I Pet. i.10f.

<sup>9</sup>Acts xvi.7 (R.V.).

<sup>10</sup>Rom. viii.9; I Cor. iii.16.

and He was bestowed by the Son on the Apostles.<sup>1</sup> But if in time, historically, we speak of the Holy Spirit as 'proceeding' from the Father and the Son, we can only describe His relationship to the Father and the Son in eternity by using the same language. 'Just as His temporal mission was from the Father through the Son, just as the Holy Spirit Who descended at Pentecost was the Spirit not only of the Father but of the Son, so within the eternal life of God He received His being not directly from the Father, but mediately through the Son. The Divine essence was conceived as eternally passing from the Father through the Son into the Spirit.'<sup>2</sup> From the time of Tertullian the formula had been 'proceeding from the Father through the Son'<sup>3</sup>, but fourth-century writers argued from John xiv. 16 ('He—the Spirit—will receive of Mine') that the Son conjointly with the Father was productive of the Holy Spirit. Augustine, who believed that what could be predicated of one of the Persons could be predicated of the others, did much to promote this view, which won universal acceptance in the Western Church in the 5th and 6th centuries. The original form of the Nicene Creed merely had 'who proceedeth from the Father', but the words 'and the Son' (called the *Filioque* clause) came to be inserted at an early date in local Latin Creeds.<sup>4</sup> The Eastern Church believes that the Father alone is the source or fountain-head of Deity, and has refused to add the *Filioque* clause to the Creed. Eastern theologians say that the Western Church has acted irregularly in doing so, for the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.) ordered that no additions should be made to the Creed without the authority of a General Council. To avoid this criticism the Papacy did not allow the *Filioque* clause to be inserted in the Creed used in Rome, until about the 11th century, though it had become part of the Creed centuries earlier in Spain, France, Germany, and North Italy.<sup>5</sup> The clause has been the subject of much

<sup>1</sup>Jn. xx.22.

<sup>2</sup>E. J. Bicknell, *Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles*, 1961, p. 123.

<sup>3</sup>J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 1950, p. 358.

<sup>4</sup>The *Filioque* clause seems to have been first inserted in the Creed by the Spanish Church in the fourth century, and was later accepted by other provincial Churches, including the English Synod of Hatfield (A.D. 680).

<sup>5</sup>J. N. D. Kelly, *Op. cit.*, p. 366.

controversy between the Eastern and Western Churches, and is still regarded by some theologians as an important doctrinal barrier to reunion. If the Western Church were now to drop the *Filioque* clause it might be regarded as placing the Son in an inferior position.

## Chapter II

### THE SCRIPTURES AND CREEDS

#### Article VI

#### OF THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES FOR SALVATION<sup>1</sup>

Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

#### Of the Names and Number of the Canonical Books

Genesis	The I Book of Samuel	The Book of Esther
Exodus	The II Book of Samuel	The Book of Job
Leviticus	The I Book of the Kings	The Psalms
Numbers	The II Book of the Kings	The Proverbs
Deuteronomy	The I Book of Chronicles	Ecclesiastes, or the Preacher
Joshua	The II Book of Chronicles	Cantica, or Songs of Solomon
Judges	The I Book of Esdras	Four Prophets the Greater
Ruth	The II Book of Esdras	Twelve Prophets the Less

And the other Books (as Heirome<sup>2</sup> saith) the Church doth read

---

<sup>1</sup>The first paragraph of this Article is based on a similar statement in the 5th of the Forty-two Articles of 1553. The rest of the Article was added in 1563, except for the Apocryphal books marked † which were added in 1571.

<sup>2</sup>The Old English form of Hieronymus, or Jerome, one of the great Latin Fathers (A.D. 342-420), whose translation of the Scriptures into Latin formed the basis of the Vulgate version.

for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet it doth not apply them to establish any doctrine. Such are these following:

The III Book of Esdras	The Book of Wisdom	The Story of Suzanna
The IV Book of Esdras	Jesus the Son of Sirach	Of Bel and the Dragon†
The Book of Tobias	Baruch the Prophet†	The Prayer of Manasses†
The Book of Judith	The Song of the Three Children†	The I Book of Maccabees
The rest of the Book of Esther†		The II Book of Maccabees

All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them Canonical.

ARTICLES I–V form a natural group treating of the Christian conception of God, the Trinity, and of the historical manifestation of the Son for our salvation. Except for the differences between Eastern and Western Christendom over the double procession of the Holy Spirit, all the great Churches are agreed on these essential doctrines of the Faith. The present Article deals with a question connected with the controversies of the Reformation, and which arose out of a renewed appreciation on the Protestant side of the unique authority of Scripture for Christian faith and practice, as against the beliefs and customs of ecclesiastical tradition. The Article does not deny a place to devout opinion and sentiment, and suggestive ceremonial, in which Christian thought and feeling have found expression down the centuries; but it does declare that such things are not necessary for salvation, and it admits no ground by which they can be put on a par with the teaching of Scripture, both Old and New Testaments.

Now in order to think intelligently to-day of this supreme position of the Bible in the Church, it is of primary importance to have a right idea of what the Bible is. It is laid down in our Article that Scripture is the authoritative source of a saving knowledge of God, *'so that whatsoever is not read therein,*

*nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation'*. This view of Scripture as the repository of essential truth brings our Article right up to date, for it is as the record of God's mighty acts of salvation that the best modern scholarship approaches its interpretation: the Bible is above everything the history of redemption. It tells of God's call to responsive souls like the patriarchs, of the deliverance of His chosen people to whom He revealed His Law by Moses, and later sent the prophets with His message, of the lessons of the people's chastisements and restorations, until in the fulness of time He sent His Son<sup>1</sup>.

There is nothing even remotely comparable to this long process of the divine education and discipline of Israel elsewhere in the history of religion; if God has been pleased to communicate a knowledge of His character and purpose to man at all, then the main stream of His revelation lies through Israel. During this period of religious development the word 'salvation' bore various meanings—it might refer to deliverance from calamity or oppression as well as forgiveness of sins: both ideas occur together in the *Benedictus*<sup>2</sup>.

The salvation which Jesus wrought related to the removal of the guilt and power of sin, and His exhortations to repentance imply a sin-consciousness among those whom He addressed. An adequate sense of sin is the outstanding result of Israel's spiritual training; it made the individual aware of the fundamental wrong in his condition. Such a consciousness of sin is confined to the faith of Israel; the literature of the ancient world has nothing corresponding to the description and confession of sin found in Psalm 51. It was necessary that our Lord, whose mission was to meet this radical need in man, should come to His own people among whom that need was appreciated as it was not by the rest of the world.

The Old Testament is the standard account of religious development in Israel; but it was early perceived by Christians that it was a preliminary movement and incomplete in itself:

<sup>1</sup>Mk. xii.6; Gal. iv.4; Heb. i.1f.

<sup>2</sup>Lk. i. 68–79.

it was a *preparatio evangelica*, a preparation for the Gospel. Step by step, and in various ways, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews writes<sup>1</sup>, God had formerly made known His will through the prophets, but now at the dawn of a new age He had revealed the truth fully in a Son. To the Jew, for whom the divine will is entirely contained in the Law (Genesis—Deuteronomy), the Old Testament has a different value from what it has for the Christian who sees in Christ the perfect revealer of God. For the latter it has the limitations of what is introductory and relative to something beyond it. But this is not to deny that the Old Testament is a source of a real knowledge of God. On the contrary, the prophets claimed that they had been admitted into the divine secret<sup>2</sup>; they appeared before the people with His word and authority, and so we should say that their messages were a true and adequate statement of the divine mind at the stage of the nation's progress and in the situation when they were delivered.

For centuries before it was adopted by the Christian Church, the Old Testament was the sacred literature of Israel. In II Kings xxii there is a reference to the discovery of the lost book of the Law, and according to the Letter of Aristeas,<sup>3</sup> when Ptolemy II Philadelphus (B.C. 285–247) asked for a copy of their laws for his library in Alexandria, the Jews complied by sending seventy-two scholars to help in translating them into Greek. When the entire Old Testament was eventually translated into Greek it was known as the Septuagint Version (usually designated as 'the LXX'), and was popular amongst Jews outside Palestine. A number of other Jewish books written between 200 B.C. and 100 A.D. were incorporated in the Septuagint, for Jews in different places had different lists of writings which they regarded as 'Scripture'. The Palestinian Jews finally fixed their Canonical<sup>4</sup> Books at the Council of

<sup>1</sup>Heb. i. 1f.

<sup>2</sup>Amos iii. 7.

<sup>3</sup>It is difficult to distinguish between fact and fiction in the details of the story, but it is fairly well established that the translation of the Pentateuch was originated in Alexandria c. 285 B.C.

<sup>4</sup>The 'Canon' is the list of authoritative inspired writings. The word literally means 'a rule', but when used of the Scriptures it means 'list', hence 'canonical' means 'on the list' of inspired writings.

Jamnia (c. 90 A.D.). But from the middle of the 1st century B.C. the Greek-speaking Jews of Alexandria had used and recognized in addition many later writings. The books common to the Palestinian and Alexandrian lists are known, as in the Article, as the Canonical Books of the Old Testament; the 'other books' mentioned in the Article are the Alexandrian and other additions known as the 'Apocryphal Books'<sup>1</sup>. From the LXX they passed into the Latin versions, and thereby into Jerome's revision, the Vulgate, which became the authorized Bible of the Roman Catholic Church. From the first the Christian Church has used the Old Testament Canonical Books, and for centuries used also the Apocryphal Books. But in formal lists the Church has always, like the Jews, made a distinction between Canonical and Apocryphal Books. This distinction is preserved in the Article, which regards only the Canonical Books as 'Holy Scripture'<sup>2</sup>, but permits the reading of the Apocrypha 'for example of life and instruction of manners' though not for the establishment of any doctrine. The Roman Church, on the other hand, at the Council of Trent included within the Canon most of the Apocryphal Books.

In view of what is said in the Article about the exclusive authority of Scripture, the Jewish attitude is of interest. For Judaism the heart of revelation is the Torah or Law; the other two divisions of the Bible, the Prophets and the Writings, are only so much commentary: anything of worth in them was already there in the Law. 'We know that God hath spoken unto Moses'<sup>3</sup> was a typical remark from a Jew, and 'What is written in the Law? how readest thou?' was a leading question.<sup>4</sup> To know all that was contained in the Law was to know all religious truth. Study of Scripture was concentrated on it to see if there was anything which had previously escaped notice or from which a new meaning could be extracted. The

<sup>1</sup>Scholars are far from unanimous as to the original language, date and place of composition of some of the books that come under this heading. For a summary cf. R. H. Charles, *Religious Development between Old and New Testaments*.

<sup>2</sup>Our Lord often used the Canonical Books, but is not recorded in the N.T. as ever having used or cited the Apocryphal Books.

<sup>3</sup>Jn. ix. 29.

<sup>4</sup>Lk. x. 26.

Sadducees rejected the belief in angels, spirits and the resurrection, because they did not find them in the Torah.

The Old Testament was the Bible of our Lord and the Apostles; whenever 'the Scriptures' are referred to in the New Testament, it is the Old Testament which is meant. Why did the Church, in spite of the hostile opposition shown by the Jewish leaders to Jesus, their continued antagonism to the disciples, and the final break with the Synagogue, still continue to use the Jewish Scriptures? The decisive reason must be our Lord's own estimate of them. And the point here is not the use He made of them in His teaching, or His appeal to them in His arguments with the Scribes<sup>1</sup> (that was the only kind of proof they would accept), for we know that Jesus was His own authority<sup>2</sup>.

The real consideration for the Christian evaluation of the Old Testament is that Jesus saw its fulfilment in Himself and His mission<sup>3</sup>; it supplied Him with types of Himself and His work; the purpose of the Scriptures was to testify to Him<sup>4</sup>: 'for Christ is the end of the Law unto righteousness'<sup>5</sup>.

In a word, the true meaning of the Old Testament is lost apart from Christ; without Him it is like a fruitless tree.

It was our Lord's view on the relation between the old revelation and His own which bound them together; the Old Testament became the Church's first sacred book. And so intense was the conviction that Jesus' revelation was the fulfilment of the Jewish Scriptures that it led to the curious denial by some Christians that the Jews had any right to them at all; faith in Christ supplied believers with the key to their interpretation, and therefore, it was suggested, they properly belonged to them alone.

To the Canonical Books of the Old Testament the Church added the more important Christian writings to form the New Testament Canon. In order to preserve the early

<sup>1</sup>Mk. vii.5-13; xii. 24-27, etc.

<sup>2</sup>Mtt. v.21f.; 27f., 33f., 38f., 43f.

<sup>3</sup>Lk. iv.21.

<sup>4</sup>Jn. v.39.

<sup>5</sup>Rom. x.4.

traditional accounts of the life and sayings of Jesus a written record of them had to be made, and St. Luke tells us that even before he wrote his account of the Gospel there had been several attempts in that direction<sup>1</sup>. The writings of the Apostles, the original 'eyewitnesses and ministers of the word', were also held in high esteem in the Church. But we must guard against thinking that, because these documents were highly prized, that they were at once classed with the Old Testament as Scripture. For some generations Christians found in the Old Testament, although not by any methods of interpretation which would be accepted to-day, all that they believed about Christ; it was still their Bible. Just as the doctrine of the Trinity was developed in conflict with heresy, so too false tendencies within the Church (and especially a movement like Montanism in the second century with its claim to a new revelation) compelled it to select from its own literature writings of recognized sanctity, and invest them with canonical authority<sup>2</sup>.

Along with the Old Testament Christianity took over from Judaism its attitude towards its sacred writings. For the Jew the Law was God's word to His people; other books like the Prophets and the Psalms were but aids to the understanding of it. Later rabbinical exposition—the tradition of the elders<sup>3</sup>—was also respected in this connection. But the Law remained the exclusive standard of reference; there was no second seat of authority. Our Lord came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it,<sup>4</sup> and the main fault He found with the Scribes was that their traditional explanations had defeated the intention of the Law and nullified it.<sup>5</sup> He went behind tradition to Scripture in the highest sense, the Law itself. While the Church never admitted the special place Judaism assigned to the Law, it followed it in regarding Scripture

<sup>1</sup>Lk. i.1.

<sup>2</sup>Hebrews, James, I & II Peter, and I John were apparently not regarded as 'canonical' in Rome when the Muratorian Canon (list) was drawn up (c.A.D. 200). But most of our present N.T. was commonly received by the 4th century.

<sup>3</sup>Mk. vii.3.

<sup>4</sup>Mtt. v.17f.

<sup>5</sup>Mk. vii.13.

as the record of revelation and of *unique* religious authority. Hence our Article emphasizes that 'Holy Scripture' (that is, the Canonical Books only) contains sufficient doctrine for salvation 'so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith'. This declaration was directed against the Roman Catholic Church which at the Council of Trent had placed unwritten tradition on a level with Scripture as a source of doctrine<sup>1</sup>. Our Church respects and values tradition, as Article XXXIV testifies, but if *unwritten* tradition is given equal authority with Scripture in establishing doctrine, the way is open for unlimited additions to, and perversions of, the ancient Faith<sup>2</sup>. 'For we know a doctrine is neither more nor less the Word of God for being written or unwritten; that is but accidental and extrinsic to it; for it was first unwritten and then the same thing was written; only when it was written it was better conserved, and surer transmitted, and not easily altered, and more fitted to be a rule. And indeed only can be so: not but that every word of God is as much a rule as any word of God; but we are sure that what is so written, and so transmitted, is God's word; whereas, concerning other things which were not written, we have no certain records, no evident proof, no sufficient conviction; and therefore it is not capable of being owned as the rule of faith or life, because we do not know it to be the Word of God'<sup>3</sup>.

Some Protestant extremists regarded all Scripture as unnecessary; the Article stresses the necessity of using Scripture as an objective test of doctrine. Only such doctrines as are 'read therein' or 'may be proved thereby' are to be accepted as Articles of Faith.

<sup>1</sup>The Council declared (session iv) that the truth of the Gospel is 'contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions'.

<sup>2</sup>For instance, neither the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary nor the dogma of Papal Infallibility can be proved from Scripture; they depend entirely on comparatively modern tradition.

<sup>3</sup>Jeremy Taylor, *Of the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture*, sect. i.

## Article VII OF THE OLD TESTAMENT<sup>1</sup>

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

It has often been said that the Gospel was rediscovered at the Reformation, but it is certain that with the widespread movement against the degeneracy of the Western Church many fanatical sects arose which restored heresies going back almost to the beginning of Christianity: the association of these by-products of spiritual revivals with heterodoxy is a curious feature of Church history. The error repudiated in this Article, that there is an opposition between the Old and New Testaments, appeared as early as the first half of the second century, and is chiefly associated with the name of Marcion (c. 135 A.D.). He wrote a book called *Antitheses*, and as the title denotes, it dealt with the contrasts between the respective teaching of the Testaments. In Marcion's view creation and redemption were the work of two different Gods: the God of the Old Testament was an inferior Creator. God, 'the god of this world', was the God of the Jews and their Law; the Christian's God was the supreme Saviour-God, 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,' the God of grace. The Old Testament was not the account of a divine preparation in history for Christ; He appeared suddenly on earth with a message of redemption from the true God.

<sup>1</sup>Compiled in 1563 from two of the 1553 Articles. The first part of this Article (down to 'promises') was Article VI of 1553, and the remainder formed the first part of Article XIX of 1553.



On the evidence of the New Testament, and especially with our Lord's testimony to the witness of the Old Testament to Himself in mind, such a distinction between the two parts of the Church's Scripture is altogether inadmissible. And if the Old Testament history describes a providential ordering of events with a view to the revelation of Christ, then it must be anticipatory of, and in harmony with, that end—in short, there is a tendency towards the New Testament in the Old. From the Christian standpoint this tendency is due to the direction of the Spirit of Christ. Under that influence, St. Peter says, the prophets eagerly looked forward to the time of salvation, and the manner of its accomplishment<sup>1</sup>. It is in this sense that the Article rightly states that '*both in the Old and New Testaments everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ*'.

For an appreciation of the Old Testament and its bearing on the New, it is important to trace that meaning that is seeking expression in the characters of its leading personalities and institutions, and in the wonderful prophetic insights, with their feeling of inadequacy and frustration, and yet of certain hope. In our discussion of Article VI we noticed that one of the vital ideas in thinking of the relationship between the Old Testament and the New is that of 'fulfilment'. But how that term is to be understood is very important. It is a mistake to suppose that prophetic vision or insight contained a clear picture of the future, every detail of which was realized in the event; prophecy is never equal to fulfilment like that; fulfilment is always richer and more meaningful than prophecy. Fulfilment in relation to prophecy is like Life in relation to its material support. Scientists tell us that after ages of evolution matter became organized in a way that fitted it to be a bearer of Life. But this is not to say that Life is the natural product of the process which preceded it, that it can be resolved into the material synthesis it occupies, and described in terms of physics and chemistry; this is just what cannot be done. No one could foretell from a lifeless world that one day Life would appear in it. Life is more than the fulfilment of all that has gone before;

<sup>1</sup> 1 Pet. i.10-12.

it is the new and unpredictable thing which comes in the fulness of time, and takes for its own use what has been prepared for it. There is a tendency towards Christ in the Old Testament; it is the divine historical preparation for Him. But a tendency *towards* something, and a tendency *to produce* it, have to be distinguished. While the ancient Scriptures provided Him with titles, types and illustrations for His Person and work, none of these, nor all of them by themselves, is sufficient for Him. He selects among them, and arranges them in a unity in His Person which surpasses their original sense. Like Life, He is a new synthesis; under the influence of His Personality old religious institutions and prophetic insights are formed into an original spiritual fact. And again, like Life, this new combination of truth cannot be analysed and explained by what preceded it.

To illustrate this bearing of the Old Testament on the revelation of Christ, let us take the two references which meant most to our Lord Himself, Jeremiah's great prophecy of the New Covenant<sup>1</sup>, and Isaiah's Suffering Servant of the Lord<sup>2</sup>. Jeremiah perceived, as did St. Paul, that a covenant written on tables of stone was not suitable to unregenerate man, and that it must be replaced; at some future time God would make a new covenant 'with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah', written in the heart. Jesus claimed to institute this New Covenant by His Death<sup>3</sup>. The very idea of a New Covenant is revolutionary enough, but the point is that not even a Jeremiah could rise above Israelite nationalism; the future Covenant was to remain with the Chosen People. In our Lord's fulfilment of the prophecy the Covenant is universal; it includes all mankind.

Isaiah's profound conception of the Suffering Servant derived from reflection on the mystery of the suffering of the agent of God's purpose. The identity of the Servant is a well-known Old Testament problem. But whether the prophet has in mind his people's afflictions at the hands of the nations, or the treatment

<sup>1</sup> Jer. xxxi.31-34.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. liii.

<sup>3</sup> Mark xiv.24; Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi.25; Heb. viii.7.

of the prophets by their own people, the thought is the same: willing acceptance of humiliation and suffering is the divine way of reclaiming those who cause them. As the Christ or Anointed One, Jesus was pre-eminently God's representative, and by taking the Suffering Servant for the type of Himself, He completely transformed the Jewish view of Messiahship. A good example of the Old Testament idea of the Coming One and of what He would accomplish is found in Isaiah xi. 1-9: a scion of the House of David will arise, and by overwhelming physical power he will execute judgement, establishing virtue, destroying wickedness, and inaugurating the reign of righteousness and peace. There is no thought here of a Messiah who will give his life as a ransom, and by enduring a shameful death on a Cross will draw all men to Himself<sup>1</sup>. The fact is that in the light of our Lord's revelation the Old Testament takes on a different meaning, and Christians recognized this from the very first. An unmistakable note of wonder at a new discovery appears in the words of the Emmaus disciples: 'was not our heart burning within us, while He spake to us in the way, while He opened to us the Scriptures'<sup>2</sup>. As read by Christians eyes the Old Testament becomes in the deepest sense a new book; in fulfilment its meaning is transformed.

The Jews divided the Old Testament into three parts: (1) The Law (comprising the five books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy<sup>3</sup>) was regarded, as we saw in Article VI, as the most sacred part of the Scriptures; (2) the Prophets, which included the chief historical books (viz. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets); and (3) the Writings (including the Psalms and remaining Old Testament books). Our Lord's disciples were left in no doubt about His general attitude, for He repeatedly emphasized that what was written 'in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms' concerning

<sup>1</sup>Mk. x.45; Jn. xii.32.

<sup>2</sup>Lk. xxiv.32; cf. v.27. N.E.B. has: 'Did we not feel our hearts on fire as he talked with us on the road and explained the Scriptures to us?'

<sup>3</sup>Sometimes 'the Law' means the whole contents of the Old Testament (Jn. x.34; xii.34; xv.25) but it usually means only the Pentateuch.

Him 'must be fulfilled'<sup>4</sup>—and the fulfilment was accomplished in the sense which we have indicated. He often cited the Old Testament Scriptures with approval<sup>5</sup>, and the Apostolic Church freely used them as 'witnessing' to Him<sup>6</sup>, and regarded them as divinely inspired<sup>4</sup>.

But the Old Testament is obviously incomplete in itself. While other nations often looked back to a glorious past, Israel looked forward to the establishment of the Kingdom of God in the future. In this respect '*the old Fathers did not look only for transitory promises*'. The Messianic hope took different forms at different periods in the history of the Jews. Though their ideas of 'everlasting life' were vague, and only in the later period of their history did some of them come to believe in a personal resurrection<sup>5</sup>, Jesus showed them it was implied in the language of an earlier age<sup>6</sup>. But without His fulfilment<sup>7</sup> and exposition<sup>8</sup> of the prophecies, many parts of the Old Testament would have remained incomplete and incomprehensible. In short, throughout (from Genesis iii. 15 to Malachi iv. 1) it points to Him, and without it much of the New Testament would be meaningless. The inclusion of the Old Testament in the Bible of the Christian Church is therefore fully justified.

The Article declares that '*the Old Testament is not contrary to the New*', but that does not mean that its moral and spiritual teaching is throughout on the same level as the New Testament. Though our Lord did fulfil many prophecies, and had no intention of destroying 'the Law and the Prophets'<sup>9</sup>, He found it necessary to expand and develop—and even to supersede—the teaching of the Old Testament. He showed that an observance of the letter of the Law was not enough<sup>10</sup>, and that the vengeful spirit of parts of the Old Testament was not to be

<sup>4</sup>Lk. xxiv.44; Mk. ix.11-13; xii.26; xiv.49; Lk. xvi.17; xviii.31; xx.17, 37.

<sup>5</sup>Mk. x.19; xii.29ff.; xii.35ff.

<sup>6</sup>Jn. v.49, 36; viii.56, Acts x.43; xviii.28; Rom. iii.21; Gal. iii.24(R.V.).

<sup>7</sup>Acts iv.25; Heb. iii.7; II Tim. iii.15.

<sup>8</sup>Acts xxiii.8, cf. Dan. xii.2.

<sup>9</sup>Mk. xii.26f., cf. Ps. xvi.12.

<sup>10</sup>Mtt. ii.15, 17, 23; viii.17; Jn. xii.38, etc.

<sup>11</sup>Lk. xxiv.27, 44f.; Jn. v.46.

<sup>12</sup>Mtt. v.17.

<sup>13</sup>Mtt. v.21-48; xii.1-8.

followed<sup>1</sup> He superseded the Mosaic law on divorce by pointing to a prior principle<sup>2</sup> and the law concerning clean and unclean meats<sup>3</sup>. Following His example<sup>4</sup> the Apostles regarded ceremonial laws as outdated<sup>5</sup>, and in civil matters the general teaching of the New Testament is that Christians are subject to the law of the land<sup>6</sup>, but there is no appeal to the Civil precepts of the Old Testament. Even Circumcision was superseded by Christian Baptism<sup>7</sup>, and 'the Lord's Day,<sup>8</sup> or 'first day of the week'<sup>9</sup> (Sunday) replaced the Sabbath as the Church's sacred day, since it was the day of Christ's Resurrection.

Morality, however, belongs to our common humanity, and therefore claims universal allegiance. In the judgement predicted by Amos<sup>10</sup>, Israelite and heathen alike are under moral law. Hence the Article declares that the Ceremonial and Civil precepts of the Mosaic Law are not binding upon Christians, but the Old Testament Moral Law (such as the Ten Commandments, which were endorsed by our Lord<sup>11</sup> and the New Testament writers<sup>12</sup>) is binding upon them.

In general the Old Testament is to be regarded as preparatory to the New<sup>13</sup>, a shadow of the truth as revealed in Christ<sup>14</sup>. As such it is to be valued, but its teaching is to be understood and applied only in the light of Christian principles.

<sup>1</sup>Lk. ix.54ff.; Mtt. v.43f.

<sup>2</sup>Mk. x.2-12.

<sup>3</sup>Mk. vii.18f.(RV), cf. Lev.xi.

<sup>4</sup>Mk. vii.1f., Lk. xi.38f.

<sup>5</sup>Rom. xiv.14; Col. ii.16, 20-22; Tit. i.15; Galatians (passim).

<sup>6</sup>Acts xxii.25.

<sup>7</sup>Col. ii.11f.; Acts xv.24.

<sup>8</sup>Rev. i.10.

<sup>9</sup>Acts xx.7.

<sup>10</sup>Amos ii.1-8.

<sup>11</sup>Mark x.19.

<sup>12</sup>Rom. xiii.9; Gal. v.14; James ii.8.

<sup>13</sup>Luke xvi,16; Matt. xi.13.

<sup>14</sup>Col. ii.17; Heb. viii.5; ix.9, 15; x.1; Gal. iii.24(R.V.).

## Article VIII

OF THE THREE CREEDS<sup>1</sup>

The Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius' Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.

The tendency today is to decry the value of creeds or dogmatic statements of religious belief and to lay the emphasis on Christian character and conduct; how one behaves and not what he believes or professes is the vital matter. When this attitude is examined it becomes clear that it is not really the importance assigned by the Church to its Creeds that is criticized, but human inconsistency. To think before acting is the normal sequence for rational beings, and everyone recognizes that we ought to act in accordance with our convictions; it is weakness, hypocrisy or downright sinful not to do so. Our beliefs on the highest things, about God, ourselves and our fellowmen should determine the quality of our conduct by providing its motives and ends; no man is ever better than the best that he believes. Consistent living demands that behaviour should be the practical issue of inner convictions; the Christian life is properly the complement of the Christian Faith. And conversely, as we have already seen, much of Christian belief is the interpretation of Christian experience. There are revealed truths which are inculcated and accepted in faith, but all they mean cannot be fully appreciated until we have had the experience of acting upon them. The theology of the Gospels is the theology of revelation, which is verified and amplified in the religious experience behind the theology of the Epistles.

Before the earliest books of the New Testament were written, the Apostolic teaching must have been given orally, and there is much evidence that elementary 'forms' or summaries of Christian teaching were used in the Church from the middle

<sup>1</sup>This Article was composed in 1553 to affirm the Catholicity of the Anglican Church, and in protest against Anabaptists who rejected all Creeds.

of the 1st century. Attention may be drawn, for instance, to such phrases as 'the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me'<sup>1</sup> and the frequent occurrence in the Pastoral Epistles of references to 'the sound doctrine'<sup>2</sup>, 'the deposit'<sup>3</sup>, 'the faith'<sup>4</sup>, and 'the excellent teaching'<sup>5</sup>. Similar allusions are found in other Epistles to 'the faith once delivered to the saints'<sup>6</sup> and to 'the confession'<sup>7</sup>—all of which suggest a body of objective teaching which was used in giving instruction in the fundamentals of the Faith before any part of the New Testament had been written. Some of these summaries of Apostolic teaching were doubtless used from an early date in the instruction of adult candidates for Baptism, in preaching, and in teaching<sup>8</sup>. Early Baptism was administered 'in the Name of the Lord Jesus'<sup>9</sup>, and candidates would be expected to make a simple confession of Christian faith.<sup>10</sup> When the Church began to administer Baptism in the Name of the Trinity<sup>11</sup> the need for a three-fold confession of faith in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost led to the development in the 2nd and 3rd centuries of Creeds in the same three-fold pattern. With the growth of the Church, greater care was taken in the preparation of adult converts, and they were taught to express their beliefs by reciting at their Baptism a Creed summarizing fundamental Christian beliefs. In this way 'Baptismal Creeds' developed (which varied slightly in details, for local Bishops sometimes added clauses designed to exclude local heresies). Later, with the growth of heresies and false teachers, representatives of the whole Church met together in General Councils<sup>12</sup>, which issued 'Conciliar Creeds' summarizing Bible teaching on

<sup>1</sup>I Tim. i.13.

<sup>2</sup>II Tim. iv.3; Titus i.9.

<sup>3</sup>I Tim. vi.20; II Tim. i.14. R.V.M.

<sup>4</sup>I Tim. i.19; Tit. i.13 (R.V.).

<sup>5</sup>I Tim. iv.6. (Greek).

<sup>6</sup>Jude 3.

<sup>7</sup>Heb. iii.1; iv.14; x.23.

<sup>8</sup>E.g., I Cor. xv.3-7; Phil. ii.5-11; I Tim. iii.16; Rom. i.3f; etc.

<sup>9</sup>Acts viii.16.

<sup>10</sup>Such declarations as 'Jesus is Lord' (I Cor. xii.3) 'Jesus is the Son of God' (I Jn. iv.15; Acts viii.37), or 'Jesus Christ is Lord' (Phil. ii.10f.) may have been the earliest baptismal creeds.

<sup>11</sup>Mtt. xxviii.19.

<sup>12</sup>Cf. Article XXI.

disputed points of doctrine. Such 'conciliar creeds' thenceforth became the standards of correct belief for everyone.

The first General Council (summoned by the Emperor Constantine) opened on 19th June, 325, at Nicaea<sup>1</sup>. The 318 Bishops present issued a Creed designed to refute the errors of Arius, presbyter of Alexandria, who denied the co-eternity and co-equality of the Son with the Father. It was probably a revised version of an earlier Baptismal Creed<sup>2</sup> into which they inserted anti-Arian clauses which declared that the Son is 'Very God of Very God, begotten not made, Being of one substance with the Father'. The Creed issued by the Council of Nicaea (technically designated by the letter N) was not, however, identically the same as our Nicene Creed<sup>3</sup>. In fact, some scholars have denied any connection between the two, and prefer to call our Creed the 'Constantinopolitan Creed'. It is true that the second General Council held at Constantinople in 381 issued a Creed almost verbally identical with our Nicene Creed<sup>4</sup>. But it has been pointed out that the Council of Constantinople 'did not conceive of itself as manufacturing a new Creed'<sup>5</sup>, and that the description 'the faith of Nicaea' in the fourth century 'could equally well be used of a Creed, local or otherwise, which was patently Nicene in its general character, while differing from N in much of its language'<sup>6</sup>. Whoever may have been the original author of the present text of our Nicene Creed<sup>7</sup>, it was promulgated by the Council of Constantinople as 'the faith of the Nicene fathers' but that faith set forth in a form better adapted than N for dealing with

<sup>1</sup>J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 1950, p. 211.

<sup>2</sup>J. N. D. Kelly, *Op. cit.*, p. 229f.

<sup>3</sup>For instance, it ended with the words 'I believe in the Holy Ghost'.

<sup>4</sup>With the notable omission, of course, of the Filioque clause (cf. Article V), and stated throughout in the plural (Baptismal Creeds, as expressing the personal faith of an individual were naturally in the singular, 'I believe'; but Conciliar Creeds as expressing the faith of an assembled body were naturally in the plural, 'We believe . . .').

<sup>5</sup>J. N. D. Kelly, *Op. cit.*, p. 325. The same writer points out (p. 307f.) that none of the various Synods that met between 381 and 451 make any reference to a 'Constantinopolitan Creed'.

<sup>6</sup>J. N. D. Kelly, *Op. cit.*, p. 323.

<sup>7</sup>For a full discussion of the views of various scholars, *Ibid.* p. 296ff.

the heresies of the hour.<sup>1</sup> It was also received and endorsed by the fourth General Council at Chalcedon in 451. It thus comes to us as a Conciliar Creed possessing the full authority of the Undivided Church.

The origin and date of the Athanasian Creed has been the subject of much controversy and speculation.<sup>2</sup> Scholars are agreed that Athanasius did not write it<sup>3</sup>, but are less certain as to the identity of the actual author. It was probably written in the 5th or 6th century, and is more a Canticle or Hymn than a Creed. The Orthodox Church of the East has never formally accepted it, and it does not possess the same oecumenical authority as the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds. The American Church has omitted use of the 'Quicumque Vult' (as it is commonly called), and its use is optional in the Irish and Canadian Churches. It is a theological statement designed to protect the Faith against heretical views concerning the Trinity, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

For over a thousand years the Baptismal Creed of Western Christendom has been '*that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed*'. Though not written by the Apostles, it summarizes the Apostolic teaching<sup>4</sup>. In its present form it was used in Gaul c. A.D. 750 but most of its substance can be traced back to a Baptismal Creed used in the Roman Church about the middle of the second century.

---

<sup>1</sup>J. N. D. Kelly, *Op. cit.*, p. 331.

<sup>2</sup>For a summary of the various theories consult *Liturgy and Worship*, Ed. W. K. Lowther Clarke, 1943, p. 280ff.

<sup>3</sup>It was written in Latin, but Athanasius wrote in Greek.

<sup>4</sup>A detailed exposition of the Apostles' Creed is given by W. G. Wilson in *Church Teaching, A Handbook for Members of the Church of Ireland*, 1954, pp. 38-59.